THE LAWS OF MANU

WENDY DONIGER is the Mircea Eliade Professor of the History of Religions at the University of Chicago. Under the name of Wendy Doniger O'Flaherty she has published two other Penguin translations, *Hindu Myths* (1975) and *The Rig Veda* (1981), and numerous other books, most recently *Other Peoples' Myths: The Cave of Echoes* (1988) and *Mythologies* (1991), an English edition of Yves Bonnefoy's *Dictionnaire des Mythologies*.

BRIAN K. SMITH is Associate Professor of History and Religious Studies at the University of California, Riverside. He is the author of *Reflections on Resemblance, Ritual and Religion* (1989) and numerous articles on Vedic ritualism and the history of ancient Indian religious ideology.

THE LAWS OF MANU

WITH AN INTRODUCTION AND NOTES
TRANSLATED BY WENDY DONIGER
WITH BRIAN K. SMITH

PENGUIN BOOKS

For Arshia and Sanjay,
a con-fused couple
that even Manu would have loved

CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This book would never have been written but for Brian K. Smith, who conceived the project, had the idea of translating *everything* (even *dharma*), contributed many of the ideas for the introduction, compiled most of the bibliography, brought back the texts from India, furnished a translation of the parts of the book dealing with Vedic ritual (all of Chapters 3 and 4 and the first forty verses of Chapter 11), and suggested ingenious translations of many key terms. I also wish to thank my brother Tony Doniger, a lawyer, who gave me good advice on the legal terminology in Chapter 8; Greg Spinner (who did more work on the bibliography); David Gitomer, Sheldon Pollock, David Tracy, and Laurie Patton (who offered benevolent but penetrating criticisms of the introduction); David Grene, who read the translation and, as always, reacted with detailed, wise, and usefully non-Indological advice; Peggy Edwards, who typed the index, and Elise LaRose, who double-checked it. McKim Marriott, who was brave enough to try out an early draft on his classes, presented me with a long, painstaking, spirited, and insightful critique, particularly on matters of kinship, ritual, and pollution; I am grateful to him for the suggestions that I took (most of them) and beg his pardon for the ones that I could not accommodate to my own vision of the text. I am deeply indebted to Ariel Glucklich, who plied me with esoteric bibliographies and buoyant support, both *dharmic* and *adharmic*, during the final laps of the marathon. Finally, I wish to dedicate the book to Arshia Sattar and Sanjay Iyer, whose loyal friendship and incorrigible high spirits sustained me through rough passages in my life during the years in which this book was written.

WENDY DONIGER

Chicago, 31 December 1990

INTRODUCTION

> Right and wrong (*dharma* and *adharma*) do not go about saying, 'Here we are'; nor do gods, centaurs, or ancestors say, 'This is right, that is wrong.'
>
> ĀPASTAMBA[1]

> To set up a law-book of the kind of Manu means to concede to a people the right henceforth to become masterly, to become perfect – to be ambitious for the highest art of living. *To that end, the law must be made unconscious*: this is the purpose of every holy lie.
>
> NIETZSCHE[2]

These two epigrams suggest two very different views of *The Laws of Manu*, the first from inside the tradition, acknowledging the complexity of its moral judgements, and the second from the outside, arguing for the duplicity of its presentation of those judgements. These two views lead to two very different assessments of the coherence or contradiction in Manu's position on certain central religious issues, particularly on the paradox of killing and eating, and both are invaluable for our understanding of the text.

Manu's ambivalence on these and other dilemmas is reflected in the evaluation of his work made by the two authors of this introduction, one of whom will argue for an irreconcilable tension between two divergent world-views in Manu while the other will argue for their integration. It is our hope that these two different evaluations will prove to be, like the two historical currents in the text that they attempt to comprehend, not mutually contradictory but symbiotic and coherent. The reader is left free to choose, both between the different strains in Manu, as expressed in the translation, and between the two different scholarly assessments of the relationship between those strains, as expressed in this introduction to the translation.

Part I will situate the text in Indian religious and social history and delineate its sources and its subsequent impact; it will demonstrate the historical origin of a tension between what may be regarded as mutually contradictory world-views in the work.[3] Part II will argue, on the contrary, that the text succeeds in fusing these views; it will attempt to demonstrate the coherence of the text through an explication of the structure and meaning of the work as a whole. The third part of the introduction will explain the approach to the text taken in this new translation, an approach based on the assumption that the text presents a coherent sequence of logically integrated thoughts.[4]

1. The Importance of *The Laws of Manu*

A work of encyclopedic scope, *The Laws of Manu* (in Sanskrit, the *Mānavadharmaśāstra* or *Manusmṛti*, and informally known as Manu) [5] consists of 2,685 verses on topics as apparently varied – but actually intimately interrelated in Hindu thought – as the social obligations and duties of the various castes and of individuals in different stages of life; the proper way for a righteous king to rule, and to punish transgressors in his kingdom; the appropriate social relations between men and women of different castes, and of husbands and wives in the privacy of the home; birth, death, and taxes; cosmogony, karma, and rebirth; ritual practices; error and restoration or redemption; and such details of everyday life as the procedure for settling traffic accidents, adjudicating disputes with boatmen, and the penance for sexual improprieties with one's teacher's wife.

The text is, in sum, an encompassing representation of life in the world – how it is, and how it should be lived.[6] It is about *dharma*, which subsumes the English concepts of 'religion', 'duty', 'law', 'right', 'justice', 'practice', and 'principle'. Probably composed sometime around the beginning of the Common Era or slightly earlier, Manu is a pivotal text of the dominant form of Hinduism as it emerged historically and at least in part in reaction to its religious and ideological predecessors and competitors. More compendiously than any other text, it provides a direct line to the most influential construction of the Hindu religion and Indic society as a whole. No modern study of Hindu family life, psychology, concepts of the body, sex, relationships between humans and animals, attitudes to money and material possessions, politics, law, caste, purification and pollution, ritual, social practice and ideals, and world-renunciation and worldly goals, can ignore Manu.

The title of the work poses a problem, in part because the text is known by two different names: *Manusmṛti* and *Mānavadharmaśāstra*. The first title omits the key term *dharma*, while the second title includes it. Moreover, *smṛti* designates a traditional sacred text, in contrast with *śruti*, revelation (i.e. the Veda), while *śāstra* can be translated as 'laws', but also by 'teaching' or 'science' or 'treatise' or 'text' (though these last two terms give a mistaken impression of a written text: *śāstra* and *smṛti* are often orally transmitted). The most common translation of the title, 'laws', skews it towards what the British hoped to make of it: a tool with which to rule the Hindoo. A broader title like 'teaching' would better suggest what the text is, beyond its function as the basis of a legal tradition: a book of

philosophy, a religious book that grounds the law in a complex world-view that is the point of the work.

Though it is certain that the text is the culmination of the work of several authors and a considerable amount of popular wisdom, it is attributed to someone named Manu, and calling it 'Manu's' laws distinguishes it from, for instance, Gautama's laws, or Yajñavalkya's laws. But these are all mythological or legendary figures. 'Manu' means 'the wise one', and Manu is the name of a king (an interesting attribution, given the priestly bias of Manu's text) who is the mythological ancestor of the human race, the Indian Adam. Thus *mānava* ('descended from Manu') is a common word for 'human' (which, in terms of the lexical meaning of Manu as 'wise', might also be the Sanskrit equivalent of Homo Sapiens). The title therefore conceals a pun: *mānava*, 'of Manu', also means 'of the human race'.

By the early centuries of the Common Era, Manu had become, and remained, the standard source of authority in the orthodox tradition for that centrepiece of Hinduism, *varṇāśrama-dharma* (social and religious duties tied to class and stage of life). Over the course of the centuries, the text attracted nine complete commentaries, attesting to its crucial significance within the tradition, and it is cited in other ancient Indian texts far more frequently than any other *dharmaśāstra* (it has been estimated that between a third and a half of Manu is in the *Mahābhārata*, though it is not certain which was the source and which the borrower). Whether this status extended beyond the texts to the actual use of Manu in legal courts is another matter, to which we will return at the end of Part II.

2. The History of the Text in Europe: the British and Nietzsche

In the tradition of Western scholarship, 'there is no work that has had such great fame and has for centuries been considered to be so authoritative as the *Mānavadharmaśāstra*'.[7] Manu was among the first Sanskrit works to be translated into any European language. The earliest translation of the text, published in Calcutta in 1794, was that of Sir William Jones, one of the founding fathers of modern Indology; the statue of Jones in St Paul's Cathedral in London holds a volume of Manu in its hand. Jones's English translation was then translated into German and published by J. Chr. Hüttner in Weimar in 1797. The rapid appearance of subsequent translations in French,[8] German,[9] Portuguese,[10] and Russian[11] (see the bibliography), and the inclusion of the text in the monumental *Sacred Books of the East* series edited by F. Max Müller,[12] are testimonials to the historical and religious importance that European Orientalists conferred on the work. According to J. Duncan M. Derrett, the text 'constitutes India's

greatest achievement in the field of jurisprudence'.[13] In the field of comparative law, the text continues to attract the attention of Westerners who, like Derrett, regard this work as 'one of the world's premier compositions in ancient law, more valuable in every sense than Hammurabi and able to hold its own in comparison to the covenant and Priestly codes of Moses'.[14]

Manu's fame in Europe went beyond the bounds of Indology. Friedrich Nietzsche sang Manu's praises,[15] and his extraordinary interpretation of the text is worth citing at some length:

Here the proposed task is to breed no fewer than four races simultaneously: a priestly, a warrior, and a trading and farming race, and finally a menial race, the Sudras. Here we are manifestly no longer among animal-tamers: a species of human being a hundred times more gentle and rational is presupposed even to conceive the plan of such a breeding. One draws a breath of relief when coming out of the Christian sick-house and dungeon atmosphere into this healthier, higher, *wider* world. How paltry the 'New Testament' is compared with Manu, how ill it smells! But this organization too needed to be *dreadful* – this time in struggle not with the beast but with *its* antithesis, with the non-bred human being, the hotchpotch human being, the Chandala. And again it had no means of making him weak and harmless other than making him *sick*.[16]

It is interesting to note the animal imagery that Nietzsche, like Manu, uses to discuss the human condition, and his approval of Manu's treatment of the Chandala, the 'Fierce' Untouchable who is the antithesis of the Superman.

Nietzsche continues to use Manu as a stick with which to beat Christianity, which he characterizes as 'the victory of Chandala values, … the undying Chandala revenge as the *religion of love*'.[17] As he puts it: 'One catches the *unholiness* of the Christian means *in flagrante* when one compares the *Christian* purpose with the purpose of the Manu Law-book.'[18] And this is how he compares them:

Christianity's [purposes are] … *bad* ends: the poisoning, slandering, denying of life, contempt for the body, the denigration and self-violation of man through the concept of sin – *consequently* its means too are bad. It is with an opposite feeling that I read the Law-book of *Manu*, an incomparably spiritual and superior work, so much as to *name* which in the same breath as the Bible would be a sin against the *spirit*. One sees immediately that it has a real philosophy behind it, *in* it, not merely an ill-smelling Jewish acidity compounded of rabbinism and superstition … All the things upon which Christianity vents its abysmal vulgarity, procreation, for example, woman, marriage, are here treated seriously, with reverence, with love and trust.[19]

It would, I think, be hard to find a Christian statement revealing greater 'contempt for the body' than this one in Manu: '[A man] should abandon this foul-smelling, tormented, impermanent dwelling-place of living beings, filled with urine and excrement, pervaded by old age and sorrow, infested by sickness, and polluted by passion, with bones for beams, sinews for cords, flesh and blood for plaster, and skin for the roof' (6.76–7). And it is hard to see the 'reverence, love and trust' towards women in such passages in Manu as this one:

Good looks do not matter to them, nor do they care about youth; 'A man!' they say, and enjoy sex with him, whether he is good-looking or ugly. By running after men like whores, by their fickle minds, and by their natural lack of affection these women are unfaithful to their husbands even when they are zealously guarded here. Knowing that their very own nature is like this, as it was born at the creation by the Lord of Creatures, a man should make the utmost effort to guard them. The bed and the seat, jewellery, lust, anger, crookedness, a malicious nature, and bad conduct are what Manu assigned to women. (9.14–17)

Yet Manu's affection for women is a theme that Nietzsche dwells upon:

I know of no book in which so many tender and kind remarks are addressed to woman as in the Law-book of Manu; these old greybeards and saints have a way of being polite to women which has perhaps never been surpassed. 'A woman's mouth' it says in one place – 'a girl's breast, a child's prayer, the smoke of the sacrifice, are always pure.' Another passage: 'There is nothing purer than the light of the sun, the shadow of a cow, air, water, fire and a girl's breath.' A final passage – perhaps also a holy lie –: 'All the openings of the body above the navel are pure, all below impure. Only in the case of a girl is the whole body pure.'[20]

Manu is actually saying something rather different, and indeed talking about a very different sort of 'purity', more precisely the absence of pollution:

A woman's mouth is always unpolluted, as is a bird that knocks down a fruit; a calf is unpolluted while the milk is flowing, and a dog is unpolluted when it catches a wild animal. Manu has said that the meat of an animal killed by dogs or killed by carnivores or by aliens such as 'Fierce' Untouchables is unpolluted. The orifices of the body above the navel are all pure, but those below are impure, as are the defilements that slip out of the body. Flies, drops of water, a shadow, a cow, a horse, the rays of the sun, dust, earth, the wind, and fire are pure to touch. (5.130–33)

So much for Nietzsche's understanding of Manu.

3. The Vedic Background: Food and Eaters

Manu, like virtually all other religious texts, masks its true authorship and indeed must do so in order to posit effectively its own claims to transcendentally based and absolute truth. For religious discourse is always – and necessarily, if disingenuously – represented as anonymous (or as the direct or indirect 'word of God', or the dictates of Manu, the 'first man', either of which comes to the same thing). Questions and answers that are neither posed nor given by the religious, however, need not be left mute by scholars of religion. Among the first and most important of these is 'Says who?' This may alternatively be phrased as 'To whose advantage?' or 'In whose interests?'

Another set of questions concern the 'why' of the text. Why was Manu composed? What possible exigencies would call forth a textual response, or counter-proposal, of this sort? And what audience is presupposed? Whom was the text intended to reach and influence? Finally, perhaps the most important query and one intimately

connected to the question of authorship and interest is the 'how' of the text. How do the human authors of Manu establish their text as 'objective truth'?

The Laws of Manu, like all other works we have from the ancient period in India, was composed by members of the social class (*varṇa*) called Brahmins or 'priests'. Indeed, the text is not only *by* priests but to a large extent *for* priests. The subject of the rules of *dharma* laid out here is often the householder priest; sometimes this is declared explicitly (e.g. the whole of Chapter 4; see 3.286 and 4.259) and even more often it is assumed implicitly.

Like most other texts written by the priests, Manu assumes that the priest is the paradigmatic human being, the most complete and perfect representative of the species, a metonym for the 'real human'. As the 'technicians of the sacred', the priests created entire cosmic systems of astonishing complexity and impressive comprehensiveness, embedding within a conceptual structure that encompassed the universe as a whole their self-appointed role as the minds and mouths of ancient India.

This endeavour – which was already and continues to be successful – began thousands of years ago and long before Manu. For most of the first millennium B.C.E., the reigning ideology in ancient India appears to have been that dictated by the Veda and its textual appendages. The Veda is the collective name for certain texts produced by one or another of the many ritual schools. These works are focussed on the theory and practice of the fire sacrifice (*yajña*), the operation of which the priests monopolized. The ideology that informs the ritual persists – albeit in modified form and reset within new contexts – in later texts like Manu.

It is somewhat puzzling, however, that the world-view that informs the priestly ritual seems to be governed by values more often associated with a warrior class. In the Veda, self-aggrandisement and dominance were unabashedly embraced and unashamedly displayed – in the 'religious' sphere of ritual no less than in more 'secular' domains.[21] Violence and power in the social realm – that is, violence and power exercised *over* another – were celebrated on their own terms, or rather, were represented as part and parcel of the natural order of things.

The Vedic ideology once described by Sylvian Lévi as 'brutal' and 'materialistic'[22] is nowhere more revealingly manifest than in the leitmotif of 'food' and 'eaters' running throughout the Veda.[23] As one text succinctly puts it, 'The eater of food and food indeed are everything here,'[24] and what might appear as a culinary metaphor was really meant as a descriptive account of the natural and social world

organized into a hierarchically ordered food chain.

The nutritional chain exactly describes the order of the species. At the top of the Vedic 'natural' world were supernatural (*sic*) entities who feed on sacrificial oblations that were explicitly represented as substitutes for the human sacrificers who are next in line on the menu.[25] Humans eat animals, the next lowest life-form; animals eat plants,[26] who, in turn, 'eat' rain or 'the waters' from which all food is ultimately generated.[27]

'What we in Europe, in the classical period, called "the chain of being",' observes Francis Zimmermann, 'is presented in India as a sequence of foods.'[28] Nature in the Veda was regarded as a hierarchically ordered set of Chinese boxes, or better, Indian stomachs. And the social world, no less than the natural, is one of rulers and ruled, consumers and consumed, exploiters and exploited, the strong and the weak. No text puts the case of continuity between nature and culture more starkly than the post-Vedic text translated here: 'Those that do not move are the food of those that move,' declares Manu, 'and those that have no fangs are food for those with fangs; those that have no hands are food for those with hands; and cowards are the food of the brave' (Manu 5.29).

Eating and killing were regarded as two sides of the same coin. But eating was also frankly envisioned as the perpetual re-enactment of the defeat and subjugation of one's rival. Food was not neutral, and feeding was not regarded as a regrettable but necessary sacrifice of the other for one's own survival. One's cuisine was one's adversary. Eating was the triumphant overcoming of the natural and social enemy, of those one hates and is hated by:

> For the gods then made food of whoever hated them, and of whomever they hated, and put them into him [Agni, the fire]. With that they pleased him, and that became his food, and he burned up the evil of the gods. And in like manner does the sacrificer now make food of whoever hates him, and of whomever he hates, and put them into him [Agni]. With that one pleases him, and that becomes his food, and he burns up the sacrificer's evil.[29]

Consumption was, in sum, the ultimate victory of the consumer over the consumed, of the victor over the vanquished, and of the self over the rival.

The nature of social life is described more specifically in terms of the interrelations between the four social classes or *varṇas*: priests (Brahmins), rulers and warriors (*kṣatriyas*), commoners (*vaiśyas*), and servants (*śūdras*). Society's classes, like nature's, are divided into eaters and food, and supposedly immutable hierarchical distinctions are drawn between the classes on this basis. The Lord of Creatures (Prajāpati) is portrayed as manifest on earth in the form of a series of mouths: 'The priest is one of your mouths. With that mouth you eat

rulers. With that mouth make me an eater of food. The king is one of your mouths. With that mouth you eat the commoners. With that mouth make me an eater of food.'[30] The hierarchical encompassment of the lower by the higher is here articulated in alimentary (and elementary) terms: you are more than the one you eat, and less than the one by whom you are eaten.

The rather basic and literal description of the world endlessly divided into food and eaters of food was thus applied in perhaps a more figurative way to the interrelations between the classes in the social world: the higher orders 'live on' the lower. But it may be just a prejudice to regard as symbolic the image of the lower classes as 'food' for their superiors. Perhaps it is indeed an accurate, if unadorned, account of actual interpersonal, social, political, and economic relations within any society.

The Veda depicts a life where I gain only at your loss, my prosperity entails your ruin, my continued existence depends on your death, my eating requires that you become food. It is an order of things seemingly most advantageous to the one with the greatest physical strength and military might – the biggest fish, the top dog. The rank order of eaters and food in the natural world is straightforward: the physically more powerful eat the physically less powerful. And the principle supposedly holds when it comes to the social world.

But what then are we to make of the priest's claim to pre-eminence? It is from within a society governed by values that would seem to favour the rulers that the priests composed the Veda. And in those texts, the priests repeatedly declared themselves the highest class, the ultimate 'eaters'. On what ground could priests and intellectuals stand to justify their supremacy in a pecking order regulated by raw power?

On the basis of priestly control over the sacrifice. The importance attributed in the Veda to the fire ritual can hardly be overestimated. It was from a cosmic and primordial sacrifice that the universe was created, and it was because of the repeated sacrifices offered by humans that the universe continues. The ritual, done correctly and at the proper time, was the workshop for manipulating the cosmic order (*ṛta*) itself. The sacrifice was also the site in which the priests laboured on behalf of their patrons, the sacrificers (*yajamānas*) who sponsored and benefited from the ritual. Personal ends, as well as cosmic ones, were the fruit of sacrificial practices. The priests held out to their patrons the promise of a place in heaven, but also of a long and contented life, material success of all sorts, and wordly status. The relative nature of each of these rewards, however, was gauged to the relative nature of the sacrifices offered. Put crudely, the more and bigger the sacrifice (which included gifts to the officiating priests), the more and bigger the reward of offering it.

The ritualists also claimed to be able to elevate the sacrificer over his rivals and enemies – goals most appealing to the warriors and rulers who patronized the sacrifice. Rationalizing their assertion of superiority by reference to their monopoly of sacrificial skills, the priests concomitantly constituted the ritual as an unfailing source of social and political power. The control of a ritual sphere that had as its climax the violent death of an animal victim (or of a vegetable substitute) was marketed as the control of the very process of cosmic life and death. The scene of orchestrated sacrificial violence could thus be favourably compared to the much more uncertain and risky, but equally deadly, power struggle in the extra-ritual world ruled by rulers.

While the rulers may have the weapons of war and physical power, it is only the priests who are to possess the 'weapons' that tame the powerful sacrifice. But the class monopolization of powers of such very different sorts would have rather different practical results in the real world, or so one would assume. A well-aimed arrow from the bow of a warrior careering about on his chariot would instantly render ineffectual a priest engaged in his ritual. Otherwise stated, it would seem fairly obvious that actualized physical and military force could easily and whenever it wished overpower ritual technicians. And perhaps it did, in the reality that was historical India.

Even as that world was portrayed by the priests, there are indications that the rulers had certain undeniable advantages over even the priests themselves, not to mention the other classes. In one rite, if the sacrificer is a ruler certain verses are to be repeated three times, for 'there are three other sorts of men besides the ruler – the priest, the commoner, and the servant. He thus makes them subordinate to him.'[31] A remarkable Vedic text posits that a sacrificer of the ruling class who mistakenly consumes Soma, a symbol (and 'the king') of the priestly class, is doomed to have priest-like progeny: 'Among your offspring will be born one who is equal to a priest – a recipient of charity, a drinker (of Soma), a job-seeker, one who may be dismissed at will. When evil befalls a ruler, one who is equal to a priest is born among his offspring.'[32]

The all-too-real advantages of the rulers and the fears provoked by them are sometimes confronted head on by the priests. In one myth, the gods (who are supposedly close kin to the priests) 'were afraid of the ruler when he was born'. But gods, and those who speak for them, have their ways of assuring that the human warriors and rulers will ultimately subject themselves to the authority of the priests. Mythologically, at least, the ruler's power is allowed expression only through the medium of priestly interests:

When the ruler was born, the gods became fearful. Being still within (the womb) they fettered him with a rope. The ruler therefore is born fettered. If the ruler were to be born unfettered, he would continually kill his enemies. If one (viz., an officiating priest) desires regarding a ruler, 'May he be born unfettered; may he continually kill his enemies,' then one should offer for him the boiled offering dedicated to Indra and Bṛhaspati. For the ruler has the nature of Indra, and Bṛhaspati is the *brahman* power. By means of the *brahman* power he thus liberates him from the rope that fetters him.[33]

While it thus may very well have been that the rulers in actuality determined the conditions under which life was really led (as warriors and rulers so often do), the priestly authors of the Veda generally project a rather different image – possibly a mere hope – about the relative power of their own class *vis-à-vis* the rulers. The texts often reveal the priests at work manipulating their rites so as to establish their own dominance over the rulers.[34]

The priests' claims to supremacy, based on their control of a violent sacrifice directed towards the domination of others, were not those of a 'spiritual' over and against a 'temporal' power.[35] Both priests and rulers manoeuvred in the same agonistic world. But the priestly authors of the Veda represented their own speciality, the sacrificial ritual, as the ultimate weapon in society's version of the survival of the fittest.

Regardless of such machinations, the Veda nevertheless assumes criteria of ranking that may not have been optimally suited to the interests of those who composed it – poets and priests dependent on the patronage and protection of powerbrokers of the ruling class. One wonders about the extent to which the assertion of ritually based social superiority was realized in a society that by all accounts attempted to reduplicate in the social order a natural order envisaged in starkly Hobbesian terms. Such a sacrificial power might have easily been disputed by rulers and warriors whose coercive potential was, shall we say, more readily apparent.

4. The Revaluation of All Values: Violence and Vegetarianism

The Vedic depiction of the natural and social orders as determined by power and violence (*hiṃsā*, literally 'the desire to inflict injury') was preserved in later Indian thought. One might argue that it had to be if the real world was not to be ignored. The Hindu metaphor of the 'law of the fishes', whereby bigger fish eat smaller ones in an uncontrolled universe, is a direct continuation of Vedic assumptions. Especially in texts that deal with *Realpolitik* rather than religious ideals, the ancient belief in a congruence between the natural world of brutality and human life as it actually is lived is perpetuated.[36] Witness, for example, the paean in the *Mahābhārata* to *daṇḍa* or the king's duty to instil the fear of punishment in his subjects:

> All the limits established in the world, O King, are marked by *daṇḍa* ... No man will sacrifice if he is not afraid, nor will he give gifts or hold to his promise ... I see no being which lives in the world without violence. Creatures exist at one another's expense; the stronger consume the weaker. The mongoose eats mice, just as the cat eats the mongoose; the dog devours the cat, O king, and wild beasts eat the dog. Man eats them all – see *dharma* for what it is! Everything that moves and is still is food for life.[37]

Vedic presuppositions ('I see no being which lives in the world without violence'), still articulated in the language of food and eaters ('Everything that moves and is still is food for life'), are here simply reiterated. Human life, ruled by repressive power (*daṇḍa*) and *dharma* (in this case, the law 'as it is' rather than 'how it should be'), reduplicates life in nature dictated by the 'law of the fishes'.

Such continuities, however, should not obscure the revolutionary quality of other later and very non-Vedic ideas and practices that overturned earlier assumptions. Some of these had direct bearing on the overlapping arenas discussed above: human diet and the principles, if not the rank order, of the social hierarchy. As Zimmermann points out, the Indic discourses in which vegetarianism and non-violence (*ahiṃsā*) [38] occupied a privileged place must be seen as wildly innovative:[39]

> In the animal kingdom and then the human one, the dialectic of the eaten eater introduces further divisions between the strong and the weak, the predator and his prey, the carnivore and the vegetarian. Vegetarianism – a brahminic ideal and a social fact in India – precisely calls into question that fateful dialectic in which every class of being feeds on another. The prohibition of flesh, which became increasingly strict in brahminic society, was one way to break the chain of all this alimentary violence and affirm that it is not really necessary to kill in order to eat. To that end, a new type of opposition between men was introduced. It was no longer a matter of courage and fear, domination and servitude; it was instead an opposition between the pure and the impure and a hierarchy of castes. Abstention from eating meat became a criterion of purity.[40]

In later Indic traditions, no less than in the Vedic texts, social ideology was fixated on food. Vegetarianism was far more than an interesting new dietary custom. It was a focal point for what might be called a revaluation of all values in ancient India. When one further considers the intrusion into mainstream Hindu thought, as witnessed in texts like the *Bhagavad Gītā*, of *bhakti* or devotionalism – with its emphasis on 'service', 'grace', 'humility', and 'love' – at about the same time as the composition of Manu, the full extent of the reversal of Vedic ideals is striking.[41] The reformation in ancient India is in many ways comparable to the early Christian inversion of 'pagan' values: what was once called 'bad' was now considered 'good', and vice versa.[42]

In the Veda there was no question about it: 'Meat is indeed the best kind of food. '[43] Here is the credo of a personal alimentary regimen conducted in conformity with nature, as those more powerful and higher on the food chain (humans) consume those weaker and below

(animals). Correlatively, in society the stronger 'naturally' dominate and encompass ('consume') the timid or pacifistic and are therefore 'higher' on the social chain of being. Vegetarianism and non-violence, interjected into such a world-view, were the conceptual shock troops of a provocative attack on the older vision of the natural order of things – and were crucial for a reorganization of the rules for social ranking.

The original source of vegetarianism and non-violence remains shrouded. It does seem likely, however, that such concepts were embedded in the larger revolutionary programme of the world renouncers or *śramanas* who were so influential beginning in around the sixth century B.C.E. In each of their brands – the 'orthodox' composers of the Upaniṣads as well as the 'heterodox' groups, some of which soon coalesced into the religions later known as Buddhism and Jainism – the world-renouncers challenged the fundamental assumptions of Vedism.

World-renunciation in and of itself was a radical departure from the life-affirming values of the Veda. The natural world, and the social world which supposedly reflected it, were reconstituted as realms of perpetual suffering, as the recurrent nightmare of *saṃsāra* or the endless cycle of rebirth. The Vedic telos of an earthly existence where the subject enjoyed the goods of life for as long as possible, followed by eternal life in heaven that was simply an interminable extension of this, was replaced by a goal (*mokṣa, nirvāṇa, kevala*) that collapsed the distinction between subject and object, enjoyer and enjoyed. For the Vedic concern with perpetuating time – this was one primary purpose of sacrifices correlated with the rising and setting of the sun, the new and full moons, etc. – was substituted an exactly opposite concern to re-run life's movie and recapture a timeless, 'karmaless' purity of origins.[44]

These new tenets, turning Vedic doctrines on their head, were soon appropriated and brought back into the world of social hierarchy by the very 'orthodox' class of priests originally responsible for the Veda.[45] The *dharma sūtras*, the earliest of which date to *circa* the fourth century B.C.E. and were produced by the ritualists, assume that world-renunciatory values should guide a moral life in the world. Such a trick was not easily carried out, but it was to have enormous ramifications for the history of religion in India.

Manu in particular marks a critical moment in the orthodox priestly tradition. It is an attempt at a reconsolidation of an already ancient heritage as well as a reorientation of that heritage around new 'principles of life' (*dharmas*). The times called for both. Challenged on the one hand by 'orthodox' renouncers, and on the other hand by Buddhists and Jains who were increasingly garnering political

patronage,[46] the text is pivotal in the priestly response to the crisis of traditional Aryan culture.

For one thing, Manu is one of the first 'orthodox' works to extricate itself from the system of competing ritual schools and affiliations – a situation that continued well into the Common Era with the production of *sūtras, śāstras*, and 'handbooks' or *prayogas*, all attached to one or another of the Vedic schools. Manu is an attempt at consolidation and unity. The work is thus an invaluable historical witness to the forging of 'a synthetic common culture among persons professing the laws in the various schools'.[47] In this respect, the text serves as a complement to the *Bhagavad Gītā* and, indeed, to the great epics as a whole (the *Mahābhārata* and *Rāmāyaṇa*), whose objectives were similar.

As a text that could just as well claim, as the *Mahābhārata* actually does, that 'what is not here does not exist', Manu poses as a universalistic treatise. The product differentiation obsessively focussed on sacrificial minutiae, that characterized the ritual schools, is here reincarnate in an equally obsessive attempt at universality and the ritualization of life as a whole. The controlled world of the sacrifice is expanded to encompass life as it is lived and as a whole; ritual rules (*vidhis*) are blown up and out into *dharma*. The text attempts to extend its reach to all people as well as all situations – the king as well as the ritual priest; the Untouchable as well as the priest; the householder as well as the world-renouncer; women as well as men.

The form this intellectual hegemonic effort often takes in Manu is lists. These lists might very well be one reflex of an earlier, and continuing, mode of thought in ancient India: a homological world-view ruled by the concept of the mutual resemblance of all entities. Beginning in the Veda, persisting through the technical literature of India (including Manu's text), and still characteristic of much of modern Indian scholarship, is the attempt to reach universality through the inclusion, listing, and ordering of all relevant particulars.[48]

Into this new 'orthodox' configuration, renunciatory values were integrated with – or rather uneasily juxtaposed to – worldly concerns. Most jarringly, the teachings of those who despised the social world became templates for reorganizing the principles governing social rank. Louis Dumont has contended that 'purity' – largely articulated in terms set by the world-renouncers – replaced sacrificial skills as the mainstay in the priest's ideological arsenal.[49] Vegetarianism and non-violence became the principal signifiers of this 'purity' that jostled power, the new yardsticks for social ranking in the priestly and 'orthodox' reformation of Vedism documented in the *dharma* texts. Indeed, whereas in the Veda ritual technique (insofar as it deals with

the ‘symbolic’) was in some respects the exception to the rule of actualized physical and military power, in post-Vedic Hinduism power becomes the exception to the rule of ‘purity’.

But why? What possible impetus might account for such a revolutionary shift among those arbiters of life in the world, complementing and imitating the shift occurring in the jungles, forests, and wastelands where the world-renouncers retreated from *saṃsāra*? While surely the phenomenon is over-determined, we have already hinted at one possible factor.

‘One can never get meat without violence to creatures with the breath of life,’ so admits Manu (5.48). Eschewing animal flesh was an attempt to break free from the shackles of the food chain and to claim, as Zimmermann says, that it is not really necessary to kill in order to eat.[50] Vegetarianism was put forward as the only way to liberate oneself from the bonds of natural violence that adversely affected one’s karma. A concomitant of this new dietary practice was a social hierarchy governed to a large extent by the relative realization of the ideal of non-violence. The rank order of the social classes did not change. But the rationale for the ranking did.

The non-violent principles regulating the ideal personal diet as well as the ideal social order, on the one hand, and the violent principles determining the actual course of nature, on the other, became antitheses. Nature and culture were disjoined. In place of a ‘natural’ legitimation for cultural practices like diet and the positioning of the social classes according to relative domination of others was substituted an ideal that transcended, and contradicted, the nasty world of *saṃsāra*.

Most importantly, the introduction of vegetarianism and non-violence – by those who turned their backs on the social world and denied any insuperable relationship between human potentiality and natural limitations – may very well have been regarded as opportune by a class of priests and intellectuals whose ritual (or ‘symbolic’) base for social supremacy might appear a bit shaky in the Vedic world of (‘non-symbolic’) martial values. The superiority that the priests assumed, on what might have been regarded by others as dubious grounds, in the Vedic struggle of eaters and food may have been consolidated only in post-Vedic times by rewriting the rules of the game. Priestly social precedence, otherwise put, may have become virtually indisputable only with the introduction of non-violence as the criterion for ‘purity’ and as the paradigmatic practice for social standing.

To the degree that imitation of the priest’s pattern of life is operative as a form of upward mobility in caste society,[51]

vegetarianism and non-violence became generalized ideals. And as such, they clearly presented a problem to those whose livelihoods depended on killing (warriors, of course, but also, for example, farmers whose ploughs destroyed lower life-forms). Beginning in Manu (10.63), non-violence is usually listed among other qualities that comprise universal (*sāmānya*) *dharma*, applicable to all regardless of class or caste.[52] Those castes who follow occupations entailing relatively little violence towards other beings and who practise vegetarianism were, generally and theoretically speaking, ranked higher than those who do not.

When priestly authors praised the pursuit of *svadharma* or class-nuanced duty, it could only be regarded as a cynical sop thrown to inferiorized social groups. Kṛṣṇa's declaration to the warrior Arjuna in the *Gītā* that 'it is better to do your own duty poorly than another's well' (a paraphrase of Manu 10.97) failed to mention the fact that Arjuna's own duty would forever doom him to relative inferiority *vis-à-vis* priests whose *svadharma* just happened to conform with the universal *dharma* that dictated non-violence. Here is the 'Catch 22' of the Vedic philosophy of resemblance that Manu perpetuates and reworks: the hierarchically superior prototype is also the generalizable archetype – the *svadharma* of priests is nothing but the 'general' *dharma* applicable, until contradicted, to all others. And it is precisely in the contradiction that hierarchical inferiority becomes inevitable: the violent ruler is relegated to a place of 'incompletion' *vis-à-vis* the non-violent prototype, the priest.

Nevertheless maintaining their high position in the caste hierarchy, second only to the priests, the warriors and rulers become categorically anomalous in light of their carnivorous bent and occupational commitment to violence. Henceforth, as Dumont and others have noted, 'purity' (defined in large part by how near one's mode of life approximated the ideal of non-violence) and power, manifest respectively in the figures of the priest and the ruler, were established as alternative and contradictory principles, with the former taking precedence over the latter in the theoretical hierarchical scheme of things. Power was not entirely banished from society – for the very good reason that it could not be – but was, again, inferiorized in relation to priestly ideals.

Some things, however, never change. For although the infusion of an ethic of non-violence into the social order rendered the rulers theoretically inferior to the priests (just as the priests' monopoly on ritual technology had done in the Veda), in real life things are different. As Dumont puts it, 'In theory, power is ultimately subordinate to priesthood, whereas in fact priesthood submits to power.'[53]

Manu presents one of the finest examples in Indian literature of the insoluble contradiction between religious ideals (like non-violence) and secular reality (which always entails violence). As a text on *dharma*, it is by definition caught in the universal paradox between 'what should be' and 'what is' – for *dharma* strives to be both descriptive and prescriptive.[54] Attempting to prescribe an order of things guided by ideals that called upon humans to transcend the human condition (e.g., eat without killing), while at the same time presuming to be descriptive, realistic, and wise about actual human affairs, Manu is caught on the horns of a dilemma. The priests may have thought it advantageous to throw in their lot with the renouncers, and indeed by doing so shored up considerably their claims to predominance by renegotiating the terms of social rank. The price, however, was the formulation of a social system whose principles were at war with themselves, and a religious system which constantly threatened to become irrelevant to the world in which most people lived, married, eked out a living, grew old, and died – and killed, at every juncture.

The 'conflict of tradition' such a new order entailed[55] had many reflexes. These included a crisis in the role of the Brahmin as 'priest' (fulfilling his social function only at the risk of 'pollution' through contact with others), an absence of true legitimation for political rule, and a paradoxical conception of *dharma*, the 'principles of life'. The fulfilment of the prescriptive side of *dharma* was mostly impossible; and the descriptive aspects of the 'principles of life' were necessarily constituted as one large set of 'emergencies'. Manu, like all texts caught in such a web, is left with unrealizable ideals, on the one hand, and applicable rules for a reality that has been relegated to a *status in extremis*. Manu is not so much a text on *dharma* as it is on *āpad dharma* – the principles of life led in a perpetual state of crisis.

5. The Authority of the Veda in Manu

One of the most important strategic moves made in Manu and other texts was a full equation of priestly authority and Vedic authority, of 'God' and the priestly 'forefathers', of revelation and tradition. Not only did it have the effect of further bolstering the claims of the priesthood to social supremacy; it also made possible perpetual revelation via the mouths of the class mythically envisioned as the mouth of the creator. Interpretation and revelation were wholly conflated in the person of the 'learned priest'. Thus the distinction between transcendent revelation (*śruti*) and the traditional teachings of human wise-men (*smṛti*) – a distinction that Indology has made so much of – is meaningless when it comes to the question of authority.

In Manu, the Veda is regarded as both immanent and transcendent. Both aspects of Veda are generated out of the *brahman*, but the transcendent Veda is 'secret' (Manu 11.265-6). One is reminded here of the opening line of the *Tao Te Ching*: 'The *tao* that can be named is not the real *tao*.' The eternal Veda is thus said to exist outside of time altogether; alternatively, it is portrayed as having been created at the very dawn of time. Manu includes in his list of things that are known 'from the Veda alone' the three worlds (earth, atmosphere, and sky), the past, present, and future, sound, touch, colour, taste, and smell – and the four social classes (Manu 12.97–8). The pride of place of the priestly class in the social structure is authorized by the Veda and continually reinforced by the subsequent teachings of the priests. For the dicta of the priests are, inevitably, grounded in the Veda: 'By his very birth a priest is a deity even for the gods and the only authority for people in this world, for the Veda is the foundation in this matter' (Manu 11.85).

The Veda was established quite early on as unquestionable revelation, the source of all knowledge, and as the canonical touchstone for all subsequent 'orthodox' truth claims. Correlatively, the Vedic sacrifice became the paradigm of all praxis in post-Vedic Hindu traditions.[56] In texts like Manu, the absolute authority of both Vedic knowledge and Vedic practice was brokered by a priestly class who borrowed from the 'prestige of origins' that the Veda and the sacrifice represented even while they embraced anti-Vedic pacifistic principles. In the *dharma* texts, priests are set apart from all others in that they officiate at sacrifices (as well as offer them, as others of the 'twice-born' are still supposed to do) and teach (as well as learn) the Veda, which is all about those sacrifices. Thus, in addition to precedence claimed in terms of 'purity' based on non-violence, the priests continued to claim it on the grounds of their expertise in the knowledge and performance of an intrinsically violent ritual that was often explicitly directed towards aggressive ends.[57]

The paradox did not escape the attention of the priests. In texts like Manu, the priests did their best to reconcile the two contradictory rationales for their own social superiority. One of the methods devised to do so was to turn on the fog machine: 'Killing in a sacrifice is not killing … The violence to those that move and those that do not move which is sanctioned by the Veda – that is known as non-violence' (Manu 5.39, 44).[58] Sacrifice, in effect, is here revealed to be the ultimate form of non-violence, just as in an early time, under different contingencies, it had been represented as the ultimate form of violence.

Another means for transforming the bellicose sacrifice was to redirect its purpose. Instead of a weapon deployed against the hated

other (one's 'enemy', one's 'food'), certain sacrifices were reconstituted as expiations for the inevitable violence of the householder's everyday life. Manu 3.68–9, on the five 'great sacrifices' of the householder, provides a prime example of such an expedient. As Madeleine Biardeau has written about this passage, 'The main point of the religious activity of the Brahmins amounts to a series of expiations.'[59] The canonical sacrifice here takes on radically different significances in the light of new contingencies. More to the point, the priestly class could in this way maintain the older basis for social precedence (superior 'fire power', so to say, by virtue of monopoly over the sacrifice) while shoring up their social status – especially over and against the rulers – with the exact opposite principle (superior 'purity' by virtue of non-violence).

Vedism and Hinduism meet in Manu. And from the outsider's point of view, the confluence entails insoluble contradictions and frenzied attempts to overcome them. The Veda and the Vedic sacrifice were largely irrelevant and to some extent embarrassing to a later group of religious leaders with a different agenda. At the same time, the Veda and the sacrifice, *qua* canon and canonical practice, could not be ignored.

This situation is hardly unique to Indian religions. Saddled with a canonical set of texts written thousands of years ago in the Near East, Christians have ever since had to overcome similar embarrassments and irrelevancies – most recently, for example, the fact that Jesus was not a woman or an androgyne; that he was not well versed in Marxism; and that he did not declare his opinion one way or another on abortion, prayer in the public schools, or virtually any other contemporary social issue. This has not stopped Christians from imagining that the New Testament does indeed speak to these concerns, any more than Hindus have forgone stating that non-violence is somehow Vedic.

The history of religions is the history of the ways humans have redeployed the authority of a 'timeless' canon to justify ever new and changing doctrines and practices. Manu is one such moment in the history of Indian religion and, given its influence on later reconstructions, it is a moment worth pondering.

1. The Coherence of Manu

The Laws of Manu encompasses contradictions that may indeed be ultimately 'insoluble',[60] but not necessarily irreconcilable, nor are its attempts to reconcile them necessarily 'frenzied'. Given the historical background, it is not surprising that Manu expresses a number of different views on many basic points. Different parts of the text were added at different periods (the portions dealing with legal cases are generally regarded as the latest) and, in the recension that we have, some topics are split up and treated in several different places, or in what seem to us to be the wrong places. Manu could have used a good editor to smooth over the awkward spots where two different texts have obviously been juxtaposed. But to grant that a text composed in increments over several centuries often betrays its chequered past, despite its constant attempts to integrate each new view, is not to grant that it is a profoundly and naively ambivalent text blind to its own inherent contradictions.

Many scholars believe that the text of Manu is a hotchpotch of inconsistency like Nietzsche's hotchpotch Chandala, a 'confused' half-caste (*saṃkīrṇa*). This attitude has been characterized by followers of Edward Said as 'Orientalist'; it is based upon an arrogant Western assumption that 'Orientals' are radically alien even in their basic cognitive processes, that, unlike us, they do not recognize or understand contradictions when they encounter or generate them. Such an assumption ignores the fact that most great religious traditions, including our own, are the result of historical conflations and express insoluble contradictions. Thus we are now at pains to resolve a traditional cultural abhorrence of abortion with a new awareness of its possible justification in certain circumstances; the ambivalence and inconsistency of our present legal decisions on this issue reflect these tensions. The refusal to grant equal respect to Manu's inconsistencies is an example of the wrong sort of 'Orientalism'. We must of course grant that, historically, both a Vedic tradition of sacrifice and violence and a later tradition of vegetarianism and non-violence were brought together in the final redaction of Manu. But we must also give Manu credit for synthesizing those traditions and structuring them in such a way as to illuminate his own interpretation of their interrelationship.[61]

On the one hand, it may be argued that *all* people, everywhere, argue their essential paradoxes through what Gilbert Ryle has called 'litigations between lines of thought'.[62] Arguments about coherence, about authority and legitimation, about the rationality of irrational

(divine) decrees, such as are applied to Manu, are also made with regard to Western texts; this is not an 'Oriental' problem. On the other hand, one might argue that the Hindus have devised particularly creative ways to deal with ambiguity and paradox, ways from which we might learn.[63] And this argument does not necessarily imply any pejorative 'Orientalism'.

A. K. Ramanujan has argued against the allegations of 'inconsistency' in Manu and other Indian texts. He goes on to say,

> One has only to read Manu after a bit of Kant to be struck by the former's extraordinary lack of universality. He seems to have no clear notion of a universal *human* nature from which one can deduce ethical decrees … To be moral, for Manu, is to particularize – to ask who did what, to whom and when. Shaw's comment, 'Do not do unto others as you would have they should do unto you. Their tastes may not be the same' will be closer to Manu's view, except he would substitute 'natures or classes' for 'tastes'.

We can, therefore, find consistency in Manu only when we realize that his laws (such as 7.41 and 8.267, which Ramanujan cites), like all aspects of *dharma*, are 'context-sensitive'. When one takes this into consideration, as well as the relative factors of *dharma* appropriate to each stage of life, each station or class, each given nature, and the *dharma* of extremity,

> each addition is really a subtraction from any universal law. There is not much left of an absolute or common *(sādhāraṇa) dharma* which the texts speak of, if at all, as a last and not as a first resort. They seem to say, if you fit no contexts or conditions, which is unlikely, fall back on the universal.[64]

Thus the fragmented history and form of the text do not preclude an integrated world-view. The text encompasses as much as possible; its goal is not applicability but totality, like the culture itself. The repeated themes and lists are inherited pieces of the *bricolage* of ancient Indian culture, scraps that can be woven into a patchwork, but that patchwork is, in the end, a whole blanket, a security blanket for the civilization. *The Laws of Manu* is no more a motley of law-codes than T. S. Eliot's *The Waste Land* is a motley of quotes from the Upaniṣads and *The Golden Bough*. It is an integrated work made up in part from pieces of other works, a coherent resolution of contradictory Vedic and post-Vedic world-views.

Yet we would do well to remember that there are orders, degrees, gradations of rationality and coherence. Inconsistency and contradiction are characteristic of most great religious texts, including Manu; but incoherence, or the failure to come to terms with one's inconsistencies and contradictions, is another matter. All texts set out, in one way or another, to weed out incoherence, which tends nevertheless, like the jungle, to crawl back into the tidy gardens of the mind. It is at such fissures that we can often locate ideology, which has been called 'the most important form of intellectual incoherence

or violence'.[65] Manu's encompassing agenda is often most blatantly apparent precisely at the junctures (*parvans*, he would call them) of previously warring, now uneasily reconciled, world-views.

But this agenda is not merely political; Edward Said was wrong when he said it was *all politics*. Some of it is politics, and we are grateful to Said for raising our consciousness of this uncomfortable fact; but some of it is *not* politics, and here he has put us on the wrong scent. Brahmins (like all the rest of us) have at least two agendas; they do have a political agenda, but they also have an intellectual agenda. *The Laws of Manu* may well have been inspired in part by the desire to establish Brahmin status over physical force (Kṣatriyas) and economic power (Vaiśyas), but it was also inspired by the desire to solve the human, intellectual, psychological, logical problems of killing and eating, making love and dying.

Of course there is always the danger that the coherence is in the eye of the beholder, that we project upon the text a pattern that is not of its making. But we have no choice but to attempt to think the text in English, and, in the course of that attempt, to apprehend the text as a coherent, if not necessarily always consistent, approach to religious law. We must make this attempt for at least two reasons, one arising from the nature of the author(s) and the other from the nature of the reader(s), ourselves. We must assume that the author(s) saw coherence in it for the simple but compelling reason that the tradition regards the product as a single text and treats it as a text. And we ourselves must see coherence in it as a whole because there is simply no other way to *begin* to read a text, however much scepticism we may develop in response to particular passages as we get to know it better. The gymnastics that the Indian commentators go through on some occasions (often in blatant disagreement not only with one another but with the patent meaning of the original verse) suggests that, like us, they too sometimes failed to make sense of the text. Yet we must assume that if we knew enough about the culture, we would at least know why something puzzling to us made sense to them, though we may still find it irrational in light of our assumptions about the world.

We must begin the confrontation or translation of a foreign text (for every reader is in a very real sense a translator) with what George Steiner has called 'initiative trust':

> an investment of belief, underwritten by previous experience but epistemologically exposed and psychologically hazardous, in the meaningfulness, in the 'seriousness' of the facing or, strictly speaking, adverse text. We venture a leap: we grant *ab initio* that there is 'something there' to be understood. All understanding, and the demonstrative statement of understanding which is translation, starts with an act of trust … which derives from a sequence of phenomenological assumptions about the coherence of the world, about the presence of meaning in very different, perhaps formally antithetical semantic systems, about the validity of analogy and parallel. The radical generosity of the translator ('I grant beforehand that there

must be something there'), his trust in the 'other', as yet untried, unmapped alterity of statement … But the trust can never be final. It is betrayed, trivially, by nonsense, by the discovery that 'there is nothing there' to elicit and translate … 'This means nothing' asserts the exasperated child in front of his Latin reader or the beginner at Berlitz … As he sets out, the translator must gamble on the coherence, on the symbolic plenitude of the world. Concomitantly he leaves himself vulnerable, though only in extremity and at the theoretical edge, to two dialectically related, mutually determined metaphysical risks. He may find that 'anything' or 'almost anything' can mean 'everything' … Or he may find that there is 'nothing there' which can be divorced from its formal autonomy …[66]

Steiner goes on to describe the further stages of aggression (thrust and penetration) and incorporation (assimilation and accommodation), but he returns at the end to the final stage of 'reciprocity in order to restore balance'. Thus at the start and at the finish of translating, we must be in harmony with the text.

Similarly, Walter Benjamin has remarked that 'a translation, instead of resembling the meaning of the original, must *lovingly* and in detail incorporate the original's mode of signification'.[67] In the case of Manu, we may have to take this advice with a grain of salt; it may be difficult to translate 'lovingly' and with 'initiative trust' what Manu says about women and about Untouchables. But we must still respect and attempt to convey the power with which he expresses opinions that we do not share, for this is the only way that we can hope to begin to enter his moral world. Manu speaks not as an individual but as the conscience of at least part of his society. His text therefore challenges us to ask how it can be that a human being or a whole culture that we must assume is, by nature, no worse than we are could believe and express ideas that we judge to be evil. And even if we ultimately fail to achieve this empathy, our 'loving' translation, by preserving something of the clarity of the original voice, will at least make possible an equal but opposite, and perhaps equally valuable, reaction: it will allow those who find it evil to see the full power of its evil. In this way the translator can hope to make the 'aggressive penetration' of the text not the rape that the anti-'Orientalists' see in any translation, but an act of love. The assumption of coherence is therefore a strategy of anti-anti-'Orientalism,' for which, like post-post-Structuralism, the time has come.

The nineteenth-century translators and commentators were indeed 'Orientalists' of the wrong sort. F. Max Müller thought the Brāhmaṇas were 'simply twaddle, and what is worse, theological twaddle', while Julius Eggeling, who devoted most of his life to translating the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*, bemoaned its 'wearisome prolixity of exposition, characterized by dogmatic assertion and a flimsy symbolism rather than by serious reasoning'.[68] Fitzgerald regarded his translation of the *Rubaiyat* as a major improvement on the original text of Omar Khayyám. But the sins of the fathers need not fall upon the heads of

the descendants in the Orientalist *parampara*. Nowadays we regard the original as the master and the translation as an inevitably inadequate slave, and we respect the logic and integrity of the text.

That Manu is a structured synthesis of various subjects, arranged in such a way as to be mutually informative, may be seen from the patterns that recur in the text as a whole. The first and last chapters, parallel in many ways, stand as metaphysical bookends around the more worldly concerns of the internal chapters. The first chapter (1.26–50) establishes the law of karma and situates within it the creation of the various classes of beings, particularly humans and animals, while the last (12.40–81) reverts to the law of karma to explain how, depending on their past actions, people are reborn as various classes of beings, particularly humans and animals. Midway through the text (6.61–4), the ascetic meditates briefly on the miseries of transmigration.

Throughout the intervening chapters, the theme of rebirth in various classes of creatures is interwoven with a second, parallel leitmotif: the problem of killing and eating (two acts which are clearly separated, though equally clearly interrelated). This theme is expressed through a series of lists: people whose food one should not eat (4.205–23); classes of beings one should and should not eat (5.5–44); situations in which lawsuits arise between humans and livestock (8.229–40); punishments for people who injure (8.296–8), steal (8.324–8), or kill (11.132–44) various animals; animals (including humans) that priests should not sell (10.86–9); and vows of restoration for anyone who has, advertently or inadvertently, injured, stolen, killed, or eaten (or even eaten the excrement of) various animals (11.54–227). More subtle relationships between humans and animals are also addressed; there are punishments for urinating on a cow (4.52) or having sex with other female animals (11.174).

The same animals and people recur in many different lists, with particular variants here and there; whenever he sets his mind to the problems of evil and violence, Manu tends to round up the usual suspects. And the animals which are the problem are also the solution: various crimes, some having nothing to do with animals, are punished by animals. Thus adulterous women are to be devoured by dogs or paraded on donkeys (8.370–71) and are reborn as jackals (9.30), and thieves are to be trampled to death by elephants (8.34); while cow-killing and various other misdemeanours may be atoned for by keeping company with cows and refraining from reporting them when they pilfer food and water (11.109–15). Manu also refers to the Vedic horse-sacrifice as a supreme source of purification and restoration (5.53, 11.261).

A third basic theme is further interwoven into the warp of rebirth

and the woof of the mutual killing and eating of humans and animals. This theme that pervades Manu, that is indeed the central agenda of the text, is the distinction between good and bad people. Violations of the taboos of killing and eating (that is, eating, selling, injuring, or killing the wrong sorts of animals) furnish one of the basic criteria for acceptance in or exclusion from society. This, too, is expressed in the form of recurrent lists, blacklists, as it were, of people who are to be excluded from various sorts of personal contract, somewhat reminiscent of Gilbert and Sullivan's hero who had 'a little list, and they'd none of them be missed': people to whom the Veda should not be taught (2.108–16); women one should not marry (3.8–11); people one should and should not invite to the ceremony for the dead (3.127–86 and 236–50); people whose food one should not eat (4.205–23); people who cannot serve as witnesses (8.61–88); sons who are disqualified from inheritance (9.143–7); the mixed castes, who are excluded from most social contacts (10.5–61); the sins and crimes that cause one to fall from caste and thus to be excluded in yet other ways (11.55–71); and, finally, the crimes that cause one to be reborn as bad people who are to be excluded (12.54–72).

Just as dogs and donkeys, camels and cows, are the basic cast of characters in the theme of killing and eating, so too madmen and drunkards, adulterers and gamblers, impotent men and lepers, blind men and one-eyed men, present themselves as candidates for social intercourse again and again, and are rejected again and again, while other sorts of people are unique to one list or another. Together, and through the work as a whole, these disenfranchised groups form a complex pattern of social groups engaged in an elaborate quadrille or square dance, as they advance, retreat, separate, regroup, advance and retreat again.

This is a dance of the victims and the victimizers. For the same people and animals appear on both sides of the line, and the assertions that certain animals should not be killed and that people who are leprous or blind have no rights are causally related: people who have killed certain animals are reborn as certain animals, but they are also reborn as lepers or blind men. So, too, not only are there punishments for humans who eat or sell certain animals, but there are also punishments for humans who eat or sell *humans*, including their sons (9.174) and themselves (11.60), or who sell their wives (which Manu both permits and punishes, at 9.46 and 11.62) or drink the milk of women (5.9). There is a chain of food and eaters which both justifies itself and demands that we break out of it; it happens, but it must not happen. This, too, is the inner tension of *dharma* (which subsumes nature and culture), a tension to which we will return below.

If we grant, then, that the work has a master plan that we may glimpse in broad outlines such as these, we may take a more careful look at the alleged contradictions in Manu. One striking example of an apparent contradiction is the discussion of the possibility of allowing a woman to sleep with her husband's brother 'in extremity', i.e. when the husband has failed to produce a male heir. Manu says that you should do this (9.56–63); in the next breath, he says that you should not do this, that it is not recommended, that it is despised (9.64–8). The commentaries (and later scholars) explicitly regard these two sections as mutually contradictory. But Manu does mean both of these statements: he is saying that this is what one has to do in extremity, but that it is really a very bad thing to do, and that, if you do it, you should not enjoy it, and you should only do it once. If you have to do it, you must be *very, very careful*.

This is the way in which one should regard other apparent contradictions in Manu, such as the statement (repeated *ad nauseam*[69]) that one must never kill a priest, and the statement that 'A man may without hesitation kill anyone who attacks him with a weapon in his hand, even if it is his guru, a child or an old man, or a priest thoroughly versed in the Veda. There is no stain at all for the killer in slaying a man who has a weapon in his hand, whether he does it openly or secretly; rage befalls rage' (8.350–51). Similarly, one must resolve Manu's diatribes against the bride-price (3.51–4, 9.93–100) with his casual explanations of the way to pay it (8.204, 8.366). But it is not difficult to make sense of all this: ideally, one should not sleep with one's brother's wife or kill a priest or accept a bride-price; but there are times when one cannot help doing it, and then Manu is there to tell you how to do it. This is what one does when caught between a rock and a hard place, the Devil and the deep blue sea; it is the best one can do in a no-win situation to which there is no truly satisfactory solution.

The Sanskrit term for the rock and the hard place is *āpad*, which may be translated 'in extremity', an emergency when normal rules do not apply, when all bets are off. *Āpad* is further supplemented by other loophole concepts such as adversity (*anaya*), distress (*ārti*), and near-starvation (*kṣudhā*). In a famine, a father may kill his son (10.105), and, far worse, priests may eat dogs (which would otherwise make them 'dog-cookers', a common term of opprobrium for Untouchables, 10.106–8). The concept of *āpad* recognizes the inevitability of human fallibility: don't do this, Manu says, but if you *do*, this is what to do to fix it. This two-edged sword is, after all, the rationale for any system of legal punishments and religious

restorations: people will persist in misbehaving, and religion must take account of this.

The emergency escape clause is further bolstered by recurrent references to what is an astonishingly subjective standard of moral conduct:

> The root of religion is the entire Veda, and (then) the tradition and customs of those who know (the Veda), and the conduct of virtuous people, and what is satisfactory to oneself (2.6). The Veda, tradition, the conduct of good people, and what is pleasing to oneself – they say that this is the four-fold mark of religion, right before one's eyes (2.12). If a woman or a man lower born does anything that is better, a man should do all of that diligently, and whatever his mind and heart delight in (2.223). Whatever activity satisfies him inwardly when he is doing it should be done zealously; but he should avoid the (activity) which is the opposite (4.161). A person should recognize as lucidity whatever he perceives in his self as full of joy, something of pure light which seems to be entirely at peace … When he longs with his all to know something and is not ashamed when he does it, and his self is satisfied by it, that (act) has the mark of the quality of lucidity (12.27, 37).[70]

Thus the elaborate web of rules, which, if followed to the letter, would paralyse human life entirely, is equally elaborately unravelled by Manu through the escape clauses; every knot tied in one verse is untied in another verse; the constrictive fabric that he weaves in the central text he unweaves in the subtext of *āpad*, as Penelope in Homer's *Odyssey* carefully unwove at night what she had woven in the day.

3. Contradictions in Manu

And there are other ways of resolving apparent contradictions. Concepts that seem at first to be mutually contradictory often turn out, on closer examination, merely to constitute a general principle and a series of exceptions to it. This is, after all, the normal way to constitute any sort of legal code, and it is a method whose most extreme form was already achieved in the grammatical treatise of Pāṇini, which set the paradigm for all kinds of scientific inquiry in India: state one general rule, to which the whole of the subsequent treatise constitutes nothing but a series of increasingly specific exceptions. Ritual texts have archetypes and ectypes, rules and exceptions, just like Pāṇini. A metarule on metarules states that the distinctiveness of the particular overrides the general application of the metarule. Thus, 'A specific injunction is stronger than a general one.'[71] Manu, like the Vedic texts it so faithfully follows in this, posits a few general principles and then a host of exceptions. An excellent example of this occurs where Manu says: priests should study the Veda, and commoners should trade; in extremity, however (*āpad* to the rescue), a priest can engage in trade; but he is not allowed to trade all the things that commoners trade; he cannot sell sesame seed, for instance; but he *can* sell sesame seed under certain circumstances;

and, finally, if he does sell it in the wrong circumstances, he will become a worm submerged in dogshit (10.75–91). From the narrow opening of a law the text moves on and out to the wide possibility of *āpad*, pulls back for a moment, moves out again, and finishes with the flourish of an enforcing threat.

The apparent inconsistencies are no mere accidents of historical conflation (the 'throw it in the hopper' approach to Indian texts) but rather the natural outgrowth of centuries of development during which different minds reached different conclusions about problems that are ultimately insoluble. Contradiction is inevitable in a tradition that insists upon hanging on to old ways of approaching complex human problems while simultaneously adding new, often different, approaches to the same subjects. Manu inherits this tradition and deals with it explicitly, juxtaposing conflicting views and then adjudicating between them.

Many apparent contradictions result from a misunderstanding of the interrelationship between two different meanings of *dharma*, which in Hindu thinking represent a creative tension between what is and what should be; not so much contradictory ideals as a series of different ideals, all set forth as desirable but easily qualified or jettisoned in favour of others *in different circumstances*. The relativity of *dharmas* – different not only for different people, but for different times and places for the same person – makes it possible to state a series of different ideals, one after the other, all true (for someone, some time, some place). Thus when the marriage laws state that a priest can marry a servant woman (3.13) and that a priest should not marry a servant woman (3.14–17), that commoners can engage in marriages in the manner of demons or ghouls (3.23–4) but that no one should engage in a marriage in the manner of demons or ghouls (3.25), there is truth, for different contexts, in all of these assertions. Similarly, when Manu states (in 2.145) that 'the teacher is more important than ten instructors, and the father more than a hundred teachers, but the mother more than a thousand fathers', and then, in the verses that follow, argues that 'between the one who gives him birth and the one who gives him the Veda, the one who gives the Veda is the more important father …', he may be quoting two different traditions, or stating first the 'other' view (the *pūrvapakṣa*, or straw man, in Indian logic) and then his preferred view.

There is a similar tension in Manu's attitude to nature (*dharma*, again). On the one hand, he seems to be saying that nature (*dharma*) is good, and, more to the point, that it is entirely in harmony with society or culture (also called *dharma*), and that the king must guard it. On the other hand, he says that nature, before society comes into existence, is bad, bestial (dog eat dog or, in the Indian formulation,

fish eat fish, *matsyanyāya*), red in tooth and claw, and that the king must guard *against* it. This comes down to the basic tension between *dharma* as descriptive (which implies that nature and society are naturally harmonious, that eating and sexuality are good) and *dharma* as prescriptive (which implies that society must fight against nature, that eating and sexuality are dangerous). Thus *dharma* may sometimes be rendered as 'law' either in the sense of the law of gravity (*dharma* as nature) or in the sense of the law against slander (*dharma* as culture).

Despite the relativity of *dharma*, its context-sensitivity paradoxically guards Manu from the dangers of true relativism. He is not 'pro-choice' like a modern American liberal. He believes that, in any given circumstances, there is only one thing to do. Though he himself, in his own period and culture, is violently opposed to abortion, if he were a law-giver nowadays, and were to enter our contemporary debates about abortion, one can imagine the sort of stance he would take. He would not say, 'Every woman can choose whether or not to have an abortion' (which would be relativistic, at least to the degree that it acknowledged different ideals for different individuals), nor would he say, 'No woman can have an abortion' (which would be univocal), nor would he say, 'Every woman can choose whether or not to have an abortion' and 'No woman can have an abortion' (which would be contradictory). He would probably say something like this: 'A woman who already has three children and is over thirty can have an abortion, and a woman who has no children and is under thirty cannot have an abortion' (a statement nuanced to the infinite varieties of the human condition). The fact that he would not cover the case of a woman over thirty with no children or that of a woman under thirty with three children would allow ample scope for the commentaries.

Other apparent contradictions may be the result of a combination of genres. To a certain extent Manu's text was both created and preserved orally (as is indicated, for instance, by the *śloka* verse form and the text's classification as a *smṛti*), but to a certain extent it is, at least in its final recension if not in its original composition, a written text (as is indicated by the existence of commentaries). Some parts of the text are widely known by memory in India (the more aphoristic verses), and much of the text was situated *in* people; the people were the text. Yet it is unlikely that any but a professional jurist would have memorized the more technical lists.[72] Some of it, therefore, is a legal code, and some of it is a moral exhortation; many people have memorized the moral exhortation, while generally only experts have known the code. In fact, there are several different (and not necessarily incompatible) codes, any one of which may be invoked to justify a particular verse and none of which can explain 'the system' as

a whole. It is really not – code at all, except perhaps in the sense of what we call the genetic code – chains of Hindu-informational DNA responding, in ever-shifting ways, to their various social environments – an encapsulation of the whole culture *in nuce*.

4. 'Between the idea/ And the reality/

> Between the motion/ And the act/
> Falls the Shadow.'[73]
> 'Human kind cannot bear very much reality.'[74]

It is left for us to return to the question of the actual application of Manu in Hindu life, to the gulf that yawns between the ideal encapsulation of the culture and life as it is lived. Brian K. Smith has argued that the need for *āpad* is an indication of the ultimate failure of Manu to provide a code of human conduct that can be realistically applied. In this view, the entire elaborate system that Manu has created is acknowledged to be one that does not work when one is faced with an emergency – emergencies being the stuff that human life, and certainly human law, is made on. More broadly speaking, the whole system of vows of restoration, in addition to the counter-structure of *āpad*, indicates that the system was designed primarily for people who disobeyed it. But this is neither irrational nor inconsistent: it is the assumption that underlies all systems of legal punishments and religious restorations, including our own.

Yet, if Manu himself acknowledged the need to escape from his system, how seriously did other Hindus take it? Many a young man must have seduced, or been seduced by, his guru's wife (a situation which must have been endemic, given both Manu's paranoid terror of it and its likelihood in a world in which young women married old men who had young pupils). How likely was he, afterwards, to 'sleep on a heated iron bed or embrace a red-hot metal cylinder … or cut off his penis and testicles, hold them in his two cupped hands, and set out towards the south-west region of Ruin, walking straight ahead until he dies' (11.104–5)? Would any but the most dedicated masochist turn down the milder alternatives that Manu, as always, realistically offers: 'Or he may carry a club shaped like a bedpost, wear rags, grow a beard, concentrate his mind, and carry out the "Painful" vow of the Lord of Creatures for a year in a deserted forest. Or, to dispel (the crime of violating) his guru's marriage-bed, he should restrain his sense organs and carry out the "Moon-course" vow for three months, eating food fit for an oblation or barley-broth' (11.106–7). How do we know that anyone ever did *any* of this? Who believed the priests? How was Manu used?

As we have seen, Hindus themselves have always taken Manu seriously *in theory*. In the realm of the ideal, Manu is the cornerstone of the priestly vision of what human life should be, a vision to which Hindus have always paid lip-service and to which in many ways they still genuinely aspire. Like all textbooks (*śāstras*), it influenced expectations, tastes, and judgements, beneath the level of direct application of given cases. For centuries, the text succeeded simultaneously in mobilizing the insiders and convincing the outsiders that Brahmins really were superior, that status was more important than political or economic power. Even today, Manu remains the pre-eminent symbol – now a negative symbol – of the repressive caste system: it is Manu, more than any other text, that Untouchables burn in their protests.[75] But whether this cultural status, positive or negative, has ever extended beyond the texts to the actual use of Manu in legal courts is another matter, which brings us back to a consideration of the European reception of the text.

For administrators in British India, beginning with Warren Hastings, the book was significant for practical reasons. It was the British who translated *dharmaśāstra* as 'laws', because they wanted to use it as the basis of a legal system, whether or not it was in fact used in that way in India at that time. One could not actually run a country using Manu alone; that is why the Hindus (and the British) needed all the commentaries. It has, however, been argued (by Derrett and Lingat, among others) that, with the help of the commentaries, Manu was in fact used by jurists. Under the British, the text became instrumental in the construction of a complex system of jurisprudence in which 'general law' was supplemented by a 'personal law' determined by one's religious affiliation. 'Hindu law', or *dharmaśāstra*, was applied to nearly 80 per cent of the population of colonial India in matters of marriage and divorce, legitimacy, guardianship, adoption, inheritance, religious endowments, and so on. And in present-day India, Manu remains the basis of the Hindu marriage code, as it defines itself *vis-à-vis* Muslim or secular (governmental) marriage law.[76]

Some Orientalists have argued that it is mere 'Orientalism' to give Manu pride of place. They maintain that the text of Yajñavalkya or that of Mītākṣara, for instance, was more widely used in in traditional Hindu legal circles. We are now beginning to ask, and only beginning to answer, certain questions about the relationship between British legal aims and the history of Manu in Western Orientalism. Some of these questions are: Were the British right to privilege Manu? Did they do it to advance their own interests, or because they found that this text was really in use? Full answers to these questions are beyond the scope of the present essay, but we have begun to answer them by considering the sources of the text and the authority of its authors.

As an *applied* legal text, Manu does not deserve the status that the British accorded it. The existence of numerous alternatives to Manu in Indian civilization indicates that his was only one voice among many. In addition to the many other *dharmaśāstras*, there are the many commentaries, both on Manu and on the other texts, that openly debate almost every point. And then there are the alternative systems, both within Hinduism (including the *bhakti* devotional movements and the Tantric cults) and alongside it in the Indian subcontinent (Buddhism and Jainism in the early days, Islam, Sikhism, and Christianity later, modern reform movements still later).

Indeed, only a small part of Manu (Chapter 8 and a part of Chapter 9, which are generally regarded as late additions to the work) deals with what we would call law. The rest is a code of a very different sort, an encyclopedic organization of human knowledge according to certain ideal goals, a religious world-view. But as a document capable of actually adjudicating the day-to-day decisions that human beings have to make about such important subjects as food and sex, it could not be, and did not (if we read it carefully) claim to be, the law.

The present translation was designed both to make the text accessible to a wide, generally educated audience and to offer to more specialized scholars new interpretations of many difficult verses.

1. Why Bühler is Not Good Enough

There are a number of translation of Manu into English,[77] but only that of Georg Bühler has remained in print and easily accessible. Bühler's translation, now a century old, is not nearly as bad as someone offering a new translation might wish it to be. It is basically very sound; he makes mistakes, but not often, and probably no more often than I will make mistakes in this translation. But there are two major problems with Bühler: first, he is unreadable; and second, he often translates the commentaries as part of the text. Let me begin by addressing the first problem.

Bühler's text is unreadable in part because English was not his native language, in part because he was using an impossible system of transliteration, and in part because in his laudable desire to be accurate he wrote brutal translatorese. His Victorian prose seems stilted and off-putting today, and his archaisms effectively twice remove this ancient text from the contemporary student. He tends to moralize, to add words like 'good' and 'bad' where the Sanskrit is neutral or ambiguous (at 3.63, for instance). Moreover, his squeamishness about sex – or, to be fair, the squeamishness of his time – led him not only to use misleading euphemisms but to hedge and even to misconstrue many passages dealing with sexual matters. Thus, for example, at 11.174, where Manu prohibits sex 'in non-human females, in a man, in a menstruating woman, in something other than a vagina', Bühler wretchedly translates, 'a bestial crime, or an unnatural crime with a female'. Hundreds of similar instances could be adduced, and they add up to a skewing of the text at its very roots.

His scholarly apparatus is detailed and helpful to the specialist, but his frequent and highly technical footnotes tend to confuse rather than to enlighten the non-specialist. The very weight of his scholarship makes his text far too daunting for most readers. It might be argued that readability is not an important criterion when it comes to the translation of a text that contains so much culturally specific data. But some readers might want to *read* the text, rather than to consult or decipher it, and it is for them that I have made this translation. After a hundred years, it is time to try again.

The main innovations of this new translation lie in offering, for the first time, a translation of the text as a continuous narrative and a

translation of the text itself, without the unacknowledged retroactive influence of the commentaries.[78]

2. The Continuous Narrative

This is the first translation to set the text in paragraphs. Manu was composed in *śloka* verses consisting of two unrhymed but rhythmic lines of sixteen syllables each, a simple and loose verse form roughly equivalent to blank verse in English. Most Indologists believe that there is no continual narrative in Manu, no flow of thought, merely a set of individual nuts to be cracked. Given their view of the 'hotchpotch' and 'aphoristic' nature of Manu's text, it is not surprising that traditional Indologists have objected to the imposition of a 'narrative' structure (the use of paragraphs rather than discrete verses) in a translation of Manu.

But the text can be read not only in the traditional way, point by point as a jurist reads it (which is indeed possible to do, by and large, with the extant translations), but in a new way, as a coherent sequence of thoughts (which is not possible to do with the extant translations). Inspired by the realization that the final form of the text, regardless of its diverse sources, is logically consistent, I rendered verses into paragraphs rather than discrete verses. This encourages the flow of meaning for a Western audience unaccustomed to take seriously arguments articulated and sustained in verses and aphorisms. When the verses that discuss a particular topic are grouped together in the appropriate paragraph, it is possible to see more clearly what central topic has now been taken up for discussion, what divergent opinions about the subject are taken into account by the author of this text, and what his own final decision on that subject is. In matching an Indian literary form (discrete but mutually informing verses) with its functionally equivalent Western form (continuous sentences and paragraphs), I am following the path already blazed by the late J. A. B. van Buitenen's similar use of paragraphs in restructuring his translation of the great Indian epic, the *Mahābhārata*, which is also composed in *ślokas*.[79]

There are places where the text resists this treatment, where there do seem to be individual verses only loosely connected with the apparent context, and in those places I left the text in that form. But there are also many places where Manu really seems to demand to be read in paragraphs, where a verse clearly depends directly on the preceding verse.[80] In many such instances, previous translations had to scurry about supplying (in parentheses) the word for the unexpressed subject; left in paragraphs, the subject is obvious, carried forward from the preceding intrinsically connected verse, or, rather,

sentence.

The paragraph structure is intended not only to make the text more readable but to illuminate its integrity. That Manu responds well to such a treatment is demonstrated by the delightfully tongue-in-cheek narrative that Sudhir Kakar has teased out of one of Manu's most famous misogynist diatribes, in Chapter 9:

> The first twenty-six stanzas of the chapter 'Duties of Husband and Wife' in *The Laws of Manu*, which form the cornerstone of the culture's official view of women, can be read as a fantasy around the theme of the adult woman's possible sexual abandon and potential infidelity. The fantasy is very much that of the Oedipal boy who imagines the mother turning away from him and towards the father … The fantasy thus starts with the wish to 'guard' a woman from her overwhelming sexual temptation and from the interlopers who would exploit it for their own and her pleasure. Yet guarding her by force is not realistically possible, and perhaps it is better to keep her thoroughly engaged in household work and thus fancy-free … On the other hand, even the dam of 'busy-ness' is really not enough to constrain her erotic turbulence and our Oedipal lover appeals to her conscience, the inner sentinel … Both the recourse to the external world and to the woman's own superego do not prove to be sufficient as the more primitive images in the jealous and disappointed lover's fantasy break through to the surface … Anger and retaliation now follow wherein the woman must atone for her lapse before she can again be resurrected as the pure and the needed mother. The mantra she needs to recite for the 'expiation of her sins' is not hers but in fact that of the son … Punished and repentant, the whore finally disappears, to be replaced by the untainted mother who, in subsequent verses, is praised and equated with the goddess (of fortune).[81]

Many other human tragedies and comedies are encoded between the lines of this text, which the present translation hopes at least to suggest to the alert reader.

3. Translating against the Commentaries

Bühler's unreadability is further exacerbated by another factor that also makes his text an inaccurate rendition of the text it purports to translate, Manu's text; and that is the fact that he incorporates much of the commentarial tradition into the actual text. For instance, at 1.56, the text says, 'When he has united (with that) he *leaves* (*vimuñcati*) his (former) physical form.' Bühler, following the commentaries, says it means the very opposite: 'it then *assumes* a corporeal frame'. Sir Monier Monier-Williams, here as in many other instances, picks up that meaning of the verb *vimuc* from Bühler and puts it into his Sanskrit–English dictionary, citing it from this one verse alone and glossing it as coming from Manu, although *that* meaning comes only from the commentaries. Sometimes Bühler translates the text but adds the commentary in parentheses. At 8.377, Manu refers to the violation of 'a guarded woman of the priestly class'. Bühler, following the commentary, refers to the victim as 'a Brahmani (not only) guarded (but the wife of an eminent man) …'. Such interpolations are not necessary for our understanding of the text, nor justified by Bühler in so much as a footnote.[82]

Commentaries are an essential tool for the translator, but they must be used with more caution than Bühler exercised. When the translator encounters a word that is either lexically rare (often a *hapax legomenon*, cited by dictionaries only for its single appearance in the one verse of Manu) or, more often, that makes no sense in the verse if taken in its usual lexical sense, the commentaries often provide help. They suggest an alternative meaning reasonably close to the basic lexical meaning of the word in question, or they offer to supply an 'understood' word or phrase that makes sense of the verse; sometimes they cite passages in other texts that shed light on the verse in question. Many technical terms require commentaries to be understood, ritual terminology in particular, and in those instances I followed them and added what they added to make sense, in the last resort having recourse to the loathsome but often, unfortunately, necessary parentheses that are Bühler's stock in trade. I did, moreover, construct a critical apparatus, providing an essential bridge between the assumptions of Manu and the very different assumptions of the modern reader. But that bridge is built primarily out of what Manu himself says and what the Sanskrit of his time allows, not from what the commentaries say.

Often when I was puzzled, the commentaries were puzzled too, and would lapse into silence or infuriatingly remark, 'This is obviously clear,' when it was not. A commentator does not have the option of saying, 'I don't know.' It has been suggested that Sanskrit commentaries share the philosophy of the people from whom one asks directions in India: they feel that if they do not give you a confident answer they will be failing in their duties of hospitality towards you (their *dharma*), and so they make up directions when they do not know them. Often the commentaries offer an alternative meaning that does indeed make sense but that simply cannot be derived from the basic meaning of the word, or that entirely twists the apparent general meaning of the verse.

It might be argued that my translation errs in differing from what the commentaries say Manu says, that it is arrogant (or, even worse, 'Orientalist', colonialist, or Eurocentric) to ignore the native tradition and to substitute my guesses for their guesses. This objection assumes that the native commentators know more than a Western Orientalist knows and that the text is embedded in the culture and cannot be taken out of it, that the commentary *is* the culture.

In answer to the first of these objections, it may be said that, though there is indeed a direct line of transmission, a *parampara*, from Manu to the commentaries, that line is at times stretched quite thin over the centuries. Though the commentaries are closer to Manu in both time and space than we are, they are not so close as to be infallible; the

earliest commentary, that of Medhātithi, was composed in the ninth century A.D., and the one most often cited, Kullūka's, in the fifteenth century. Between Manu's text and their response to it, more than enough time intervenes to lose certain threads and, perhaps more important, to develop new prejudices and biases.

Of course, both native commentators and Orientalists have axes to grind, but they are different sorts of axes. The axe of the native commentator is honed on a more intense and immediate personal involvement in the text, which may give him good reasons to want to misread the text, to fudge or misinterpret the verse in order to make it mean what he thinks it *ought* to mean.[83] The axe of the Orientalist, on the other hand, is sharpened by cultural ignorance and lack of empathy, on a distancing from the culture, which may lead to misinterpretations of a very different sort. For the political concerns of the Orientalist may be further removed, but they, too, invade the text: choosing an audience (insofar as the decision to prepare a translation for the Harvard Oriental Series rather than for the Penguin Classics is a political decision), choosing a text to translate (insofar as considerations of intellectual and political fashion – 'Orientalism' vs., anti'Orientalism', for instance – may influence the translator's ambitions for promotion and tenure), and so on. 'Whose axe is being bored?', to paraphrase the Jewish saying. But beyond these practical matters, intellectually the Orientalist reads the text in a spirit very different from that of the native commentary, since the Orientalist, assuming that some meanings are historically possible, some less possible, brings different aids to the text, different sorts of intertextual comparisons, new text-critical considerations, different criteria for false readings – in general, a critical canon.[84]

We are caught, as usual in cross-cultural studies, on the horns of a dilemma. The anti-Orientalist agenda argues that we do not have the right to interfere, to tell those for whose tradition Manu still speaks that we know better than they do. But the agenda of humanistic scholarship argues that we do have the right to challenge their arguments, as we would challenge anyone's arguments, that we cannot simply endorse their faith statements. The solution is a compromise: we must try to state fairly what they are saying, and to understand why they think they are right, but we must also say what we think, and we must try to be honest in stating why we think we are right. We can see the commentators' reasons for interpreting a verse as they do, but we have the right to assert that we do not share that reason and that we therefore interpret the verse differently.

A commentary on a text must attempt to balance both sets of prejudices. And we must make our own commentary. For, ultimately, it is the commentary that brings the law to life and keeps it vital; in

order for the law to have meaning for us, we must ask our own questions of it. Any translation is an interpretation, a commentary, and mine is no exception; but mine is a minimalist interpretation, which has certain advantages. It means that I am, indeed, substituting my guesses for the commentators' guesses, but that my guesses are anti-guesses or un-guesses, in contrast with their more additive guesses.

In answer to the second objection, regarding the cultural role of the commentary, it may be said that the present translation was not created in a vacuum: the commentaries are always available to those who wish to read them alongside the text, as I myself have done. There are English translations of two of the nine commentaries (that of Medhātithi by G. Jha and that of Bhāruci by J. D. M. Derrett), and the reader may also, of course, consult Bühler, who remains invaluable in this regard. Aside from the light that they occasionally shed on the text of Manu, the commentaries are intrinsically interesting for what they tell us about the subsequent history of *dharma* in India and, in a more general way, for what they teach us about the hermeneutic process. But this information is not essential to the translation of the text itself.

In one sense, of course, the commentaries have become part of the text; but even while we must acknowledge that the text does indeed continue to live and to change in the course of history, it is possible to go back in history, to peel back the layers on the palimpsest. It is impossible for us, in 1990, to read Manu nakedly, to ignore the intervening centuries that impose a screen between us and the text. But it is not impossible to make a conscious effort to distinguish between what the text seems to say minimally, lexically, from what the commentators have obviously expanded it to say. This minimalist approach assumes that we cannot 'get behind the text' through the commentaries, that we cannot reach the mind of the author, let alone the ultimate truth of the author; it assumes that the most we can hope for is to understand the literal meanings of his words, and leave their interpretation as open as possible. Here again it is refreshing to recall that this is not merely a problem of 'Orientalism'. Arguments about 'minimalist' and lexical meanings, about the relative weight of canon and commentary, have been debated for centuries with regard to Western scriptural texts. In that controversy, the line that I am adopting – reading the text against the commentaries – would be regarded as a very Protestant way of arguing.[85]

Manu leaves many questions unanswered, such as who the 'they' in a particular verse are, and which of two apparently conflicting rules takes precedence over the other. For many centuries, commentators have argued these points, and translations of Manu usually

incorporate their opinions. The present translation leaves the text in its enigmatic form, showing the challenges that the unglossed text sets for the commentators, and indeed for any modern translator or reader. It leaves unresolved much of what Manu leaves unresolved. On the other hand, the minimalist translation presents clearly what is in fact clear in Manu, without reference to all the obfuscating complications that have subsequently been argued by later commentaries.

At 9.1, for instance, where a husband is said to be 'separated' (*viprayoge*) from his wife, the word is glossed by most commentaries as 'away on a journey or dead'. Well enough, but perhaps Manu himself actually also envisaged a situation in which one or the other partner actually decided to live apart, a possibility that he does seem to have in mind at 9.77, for instance, where the husband is supposed to wait a year for his wife (to come back to him, one might suppose) if she hates him, and at 9.176, where a woman who leaves her husband and returns to him may perform a second marriage ceremony. The commentaries at 9.1 ignore the possibility of such a reason for separation, and by citing their limited options to the Western reader the translator would be closing the reader's mind to that possibility, too.

To view Manu through commentarial glasses is often to lose sight of Manu. By contrast, to translate Manu without following the commentaries is rather like translating the Song of Solomon as a poem about the love of a man and a woman rather than as a metaphor of the love of the Church for God. Or, to vary the metaphor, it is like translating the sixth of the ten commandments *in a translation of the Hebrew Bible* as 'Thou shalt not murder', which is what the Hebrew really says, bracketing, as it were, our knowledge that for most of subsequent Western history, and certainly for Christianity, the tradition has interpreted the text to say, 'Thou shalt not kill.'

The suggestions made by the commentators are usually plausible enough, but *they are not the only possibilities*. Walter Benjamin has remarked that 'A real translation is transparent; it does not cover the original, does not block its light, but allows the pure language, as though reinforced by its own medium, to shine upon the original all the more fully.'[86] The same can be said for the commentary, which must be in *our* 'own medium'. The beauty of Manu's aphorisms lies in their transparency; the later commentaries make them opaque. The beauty of the original text is its openness; the commentaries close it forever. It is this open possibility that I hoped to preserve in this translation. For it is the privilege of the Orientalist (and I use the word in a non-pejorative sense, in the hope of restoring some of its faded dignity) to re-open a text that the native commentaries have closed. If we are to give credit to the text itself for being rational and coherent,

it is our right, as well as our duty, to find our own rationality and coherence in it. And sometimes we achieve this over the dead bodies of the commentators who, as was *their* right and duty, found their own rationality and coherence in it, different from our own and, I think, often different from that of the text.

4. The Text and the Critical Apparatus

I did not construct a critical edition of Manu, which still lacks one. Some readers might wish that I had edited a new text, but that is another project, not mine. Few Indian texts have critical editions, and translations of them remain useful; in those few cases where a 'critical edition' has been used (as in van Buitenen's translation of the *Mahābhārata*), the translation is often rendered less, rather than more, useful because it does not translate the (admittedly flawed) text that *people actually use*. The recently published Sanskrit edition of the text of Manu with nine commentaries, edited by J. Dave,[87] served as my base text, except for Chapter 8, which Dave has not yet published and which I took from the Mandlik edition, with seven commentaries.[88] There are relatively few seriously disputed readings, and where such do occur, or where there are misreadings or even typographical errors in Dave, the fact that the many commentaries cite the verses makes it easy to ascertain the correct reading. Often commentaries cite alternative readings, providing, in effect, a kind of native critical edition.[89]

I tried to make the translation literal, even transparent, to keep the flavour of the individual idiom (leaving 'fruit', for instance, as 'fruit', rather than 'reward') and to maintain, as far as possible, a consistency in the translation of words and even phrases, in order to preserve the patterns and rhythms of repetition. I have never been a follower of the yellow–oblong–fruit school of thesaurus journalism; I prefer to call a banana a banana, no matter how often it is mentioned in a single paragraph. But to avoid the usual donkey refrain of Sanskrit translatorese ('he who, he who') I often used the phrase 'a man' when no subject was specified (though a man is always the understood subject), which, I fear, may have made the text sound even more sexist than it is.

There are in every language polysemic words for which there are no English equivalents, words that have not a single meaning but a range of meanings, and Sanskrit is particularly prone to this semantic proliferation: it has been said that every word in Sanskrit designates its basic meaning, the opposite of that, a word for an elephant, a name of God, and a position in sexual intercourse. In confronting a Sanskrit text, therefore, the translator must make choices that reflect his or her

opinion of what the text is most likely to be about (an elephant, God, …).

I translated everything (even the proper names of birds and trees and castes and hells), however approximately and speculatively, with very few exceptions: I left untranslated the names of several gods and 'Veda', which is so definitive of and so deeply embedded in Hindu culture that I despaired of transplanting it on to English linguistic soil. In the case of *brahman, dharma, karman*, and a few other key terms, I used several English words to translate one Sanskrit word, for instance, 'activity', 'innate activity', 'the effects of past actions', and 'ritual' for the Sanskrit *karman*. *Vadha* is also significantly ambiguous: it designates either corporal punishment (such as beating or mutilation) or capital punishment (usually by impalement, or by being trampled to death by an elephant). Different translators have often guessed which was intended, in ways that I do not find justifiable; I opted for the rather cumbersome but safer stratagem of translating *vadha* as 'corporal or capital punishment', leaving the reader, once again, free to choose.

On the other hand, I sometimes used one English word to translate several Sanskrit words. This is necessary because, just as there are (wrongly, as it now appears) alleged to be many words for snow among Eskimos, so there are, among Hindus, many words for pollution or dirt, and though I tried consistently to distinguish between them wherever possible, there are instances in which English fails to provide the differentiated nuances to match the Sanskrit. 'Purity', the word most often used in this context, is precisely the wrong word, for it implies a natural state, whereas the Sanskrit terms generally refer to a cultural state that is constantly achieved through hard work, best conveyed by double negatives ('not polluted', 'not unclean'). Thus I have tried to distinguish between *medhya* (pure, fit for sacrifice), *prayata* (purified, ritually prepared to perform religious acts), *śauca/śuci* (purification, the removal of pollution and the resulting state of unpollution), *śuddhi* (cleansing, making clean), and *pavitra, pavamāna* (purifier, an instrument of purification). Similarly, for the many Sanskrit euphemisms for the sexual act, most of which use some form of a verb meaning 'to go to' (*gam, vraj*, and so forth, rather like the King James Bible's 'to go in unto her'), I tried to steer between the Scylla of obscenity and the Charybdis of pseudo-medical jargon, and opted for the slightly vernacular 'have sex'.

Another sort of problem is posed by the many Sanskrit words for holy men: sages, seers, ascetics, hermits, wise-men, and lots and lots of kinds of priests. I rendered both *brāhmaṇa* and *vipra* as 'priest', and *brahman* as 'ultimate reality' or 'Veda', in a desperate attempt to avert the potential confusion not only between *brāhmaṇa* and *brahman* but

between the *Brahman* priest who watches out for errors in the Vedic sacrifice, Brahmā (the god), and Brāhmaṇa (the Vedic text). Yet another word that can mean 'priest', *dvija*, is in itself ambiguous: literally 'twice-born', it can designate any of the three upper classes; often, however, it simply means a priest. Indeed, there are numerous indications (such as the fact that, in the verse summarizing all of Chapter 4, Manu refers to the householder explicitly as a priest) that confirm one's suspicion that *all* the rules in this chapter apply primarily to priests, and that, indeed, the term 'twice-born' throughout the entire text generally refers only to the 'best of the twice-born' (*dvijottamas*), the priests. Nevertheless, I left it in its uninflected and more general form, as 'twice-born, and trust the reader to decide when it means any old Aryan and when the context calls for the narrower meaning of 'priest'.

Finally, I decided to translate the names of the four classes or *varṇas* of Indian society, though there are no real English equivalents for them: 'priest' implies both more and less than 'Brahmin', 'ruler' both more and less than 'Kṣatrya', 'commoner' both more and less than 'Vaiśya', and 'servant' both more and less than 'Śūdra'. In particular, it is evident that Manu is speaking not of an individual occupying a certain social function, let alone a particular profession, but rather of a class that may be constituted ritually, socially, and ethnically, as well as professionally. It would, perhaps, have been less misleading if I had referred to a Brahmin as 'a member of the priestly class' and a Kṣatriya as 'a member of the ruling class' (a stratagem that I was, in fact, forced to adopt when referring to the women of these classes), but 'ruling class' is potentially misleading in yet other ways, and the words occur so often that such a circumlocation would soon become distractingly cumbersome. Instead, I translated the names of the classes with their best English single-word approximations, by the profession or quality that Manu himself regards as epitomizing the class as a whole.

I took this rather drastic measure because I felt it essential to my purpose in creating a text that could be *thought in English*. For a non-Indological English reader, the phrase 'Kṣatriyas do not have the right to kill Brahmins' conveys nothing at all about those two groups; whereas 'Rulers do not have the right to kill priests' stimulates associations that may in some respects be inappropriate (shades of Thomas à Becket and Henry II) but that at least *do mean something*. This 'something' will perhaps make the reader wonder to what extent the conflict between Hindu rulers and priests both was and was not like the conflict between Becket and Henry II, and, moreover, how the conflict would vary if the member of the ruling class was a king, a soldier, or a merchant, and the member of the priestly class an

officiating priest or a landowner.

The same concern underlay my uneasy decision to translate *dharma* and *karman*. *Dharma*, in particular, is so essential to this text, and so multivalent, that I needed several words even to approximate it: duty, law (a seamless combination of law in the sense of the law of gravity, natural law, and law in the sense of paying taxes, cultural law), justice, right, religious merit, and, finally, religion. It might be argued that 'religion' is too vague, and too European, a word to render such a quintessentially Hindu concept, but it is precisely the vagueness of the term that seems to me to resonate with the pervasive nature of *dharma*. The damage in transit is minimalized if we take religion in the OED sense of 'action or conduct indicating a belief in, reverence for, and desire to please, a divine ruling power; the exercise or practice of rites or observances implying this', always bearing in mind that the 'divine ruling power' in India includes not merely the gods but the impersonal power of ultimate reality (*brahman*), and indeed *dharma* itself. As for the many other meanings of *dharma*, one would really need a Venn diagram, encompassing all of human life, to do justice to it; let me at least remind the reader of A. K. Ramanujan's wise caution (in his essay, 'Is there an Indian way of thinking?') that words, particularly Sanskrit words, particularly words like *dharma*, are always context-sensitive.

But despite these problems, I persisted stubbornly in translating *dharma*, and this is why. The phrase, 'In the Winning Age, religion is entire' forces the reader to wonder what it means to say that religion is entire, and what it is that the first age wins (and our age loses), though admittedly it rules out some other valid implications of *dharma* in this sentence. But the phrase, 'In the Kṛta Yuga, *dharma* is entire' is not a translation at all, and leads to no thought in the mind of the English reader, however much it might allow someone in the Indological know to savour the many meanings of *dharma*.

In an attempt to compensate for the loss of this technical vocabulary in the text, I have provided an English–Sanskrit index and glossary of terms, names, and subjects, which lists the choices that I made in my attempt to be consistent in the use of English words for Sanskrit words that have no exact English equivalent. The cross-listings are designed both to enable the non-Sanskrit-reader to see the ways in which certain meanings are grouped together differently by Sanskrit terms and English concepts and to enable a Sanskritist to know the Sanskrit original for technical terms cited in English translation. For a few central Sanskrit terms, such as *adharma, dharma*, and *karman*, I listed all the occurrences of each of the several English words that I used to translate the single Sanskrit term, to give the reader an idea of the range of meanings of these rich concepts.

I tried to keep the critical apparatus to a minimum, using the notes primarily to provide further information on some of the technicalities of the text and, more often, to explicate the meaning of obscure passages. Where there are variant readings and disputing commentaries, I cut the Gordian note and gave the reading and the translation that made best sense to me. On the other hand, I did include in the notes material that is not traditionally included in a Western Indologist apparatus, noting not merely the legal and ritualistic technicalities but the human implications of certain key passages. Footnotes to technical terms are supplied on the first occurrence of the term; thereafter the reader should consult the index and glossary, which will also indicate the first occurrence.

Finally, there is a bibliography for further reading on the various topics covered in the text and for information about the history of the text on both sides of Manu: on the antecedents on which he draws, and the later uses of the text in India. These supplements to the translation are designed to aid the reader who seeks a more detailed grasp of this extraordinary text.

CHAPTER 1

[*1*] The great sages approached Manu when he was seated in single-minded concentration; they exchanged mutual salutations in the proper manner and then they said this to him: [*2*] 'Sir, please tell us, properly and in order, the duties of all (four) classes and also of the people who are born between (two classes). [*3*] For you, lord, are the only one who knows the true meaning of what is to be done in this whole system made by the Self-existent one, that cannot be imagined and cannot be measured.'

[*4*] When the great and great-souled sages had properly asked him this, Manu, whose energy was boundless, honoured them and replied,

Listen! [*5*] Once upon a time this (universe) was made of darkness, without anything that could be discerned, without any distinguishing marks, impossible to know through reasoning or understanding; it seemed to be entirely asleep. [*6*] Then the Lord who is Self-existent, himself unmanifest, caused this (universe) to become manifest; putting his energy into the great elements and everything else, he became visible and dispelled the darkness. [*7*] The one who can be grasped only by what is beyond the sensory powers, who is subtle, unmanifest, eternal, unimaginable, he of whom all creatures are made – he is the one who actually appeared.

[*8*] He thought deeply, for he wished to emit various sorts of creatures from his own body; first he emitted the waters, and then he emitted his semen in them. [*9*] That (semen) became a golden egg, as bright as the sun with his thousand rays; Brahmā himself, the grandfather of all people, was born in that (egg). [*10*] 'The waters are born of man,' so it is said; indeed, the waters are the children of the (primordial) man. And since they were his resting place in ancient time, therefore he is traditionally known as Nārāyaṇa ('Resting on those born of man'). [*11*] The one who is the first cause, unmanifest, eternal, the essence of what is real and unreal, emitted the Man, who is known in the world as Brahmā.

[*12*] The Lord dwelt in that egg for a whole year, and then just by thinking he himself divided the egg into two. [*13*] Out of the two fragments he made the sky and the earth, and the atmosphere in the middle, and the eight cardinal directions, and the eternal place of the waters. [*14*] And out of himself he grew the mind-and-heart, the essence of what is real and unreal, and from mind-and-heart came the sense of 'I', the controlling consciousness of self, [*15*] and the great one which is the self, and all (material things that have) the three qualities, and, one by one, the five sensory powers that grasp the

sensory objects.

[*16*] But by mingling the subtle parts of the six that have boundless energy with the minute particles of his own self, he made all living beings. [*17*] Since the six subtle parts of his physical form 'embody' these, therefore wise men call his physical form 'the body'. [*18*] The gross elements enter into that with their innate activities, and the imperishable mind-and-heart that makes all living beings (enters) with its subtle parts. [*19*] But this (universe) arises from the subtle. minute particles of the physical form of those seven Men of great energy, the perishable from the imperishable. [*20*] Each of these (elements) takes on the quality of the one that precedes it, so that each is traditionally regarded as having as many qualities as the number of its position in the series.

[*21*] But in the beginning he made the individual names and individual innate activities and individual conditions of all things precisely in accordance with the words of the Veda. [*22*] And the Lord emitted the host of gods who have the breath of life and whose essence is the ritual, and the subtle host of the Amenables, and the everlasting sacrifice. [*23*] From fire, wind, and the sun he milked out the triple eternal Veda, consisting of the ṛg, *Yajur*, and *Sāman*, so that the sacrifice could be accomplished. [*24*] He emitted time and the divisions of time, the constellations and planets, rivers, oceans, mountains, rough ground and smooth ground; [*25*] inner heat, speech, and sexual pleasure; desire and anger. Indeed, he emitted precisely this created universe because he wanted to emit these creatures.

[*26*] And in order to distinguish innate activities, he distinguished right from wrong, and he yoked these creatures with the pairs, happiness and unhappiness and so forth. [*27*] For, with the impermanent atomic particles of what are traditionally known as the five (elements), in their order this whole (universe) comes into being. [*28*] And whatever innate activity the Lord yoked each (creature) to at first, that (creature) by himself engaged in that very activity as he was created again and again. [*29*] Harmful or harmless, gentle or cruel, right or wrong, truthful or lying – the (activity) he gave to each (creature) in creation kept entering it by itself. [*30*] Just as the seasons by themselves take on the distinctive signs of the seasons as they change, so embodied beings by themselves take on their innate activities, each his own.

[*31*] Then, so that the worlds and people would prosper and increase, from his mouth he created the priest, from his arms the ruler, from his thighs the commoner, and from his feet the servant. [*32*] He divided his own body into two and became a man with one half, a woman with the other half. In her the Lord emitted Virāj, [*33*] and that man, Virāj, generated ascetic heat and by himself emitted

someone – you, who are the best of the twice-born, should know that the one whom he emitted was me, the creator of this whole (universe). [*34*] Because I wanted to emit creatures, I generated inner heat that is very hard to produce, and then at the start I emitted the ten great sages, lords of creatures: [*35*] Marīci, Atri and Angiras, Pulastya, Pulaha, Kratu, Pracetas, Vasiṣṭha, Bhṛgu, and Nārada.

[*36*] These emitted seven other Manus who had immeasurable brilliant energy, and the gods and the troops of the gods, and the great sages who had boundless energy; [*37*] and genies and ogres and ghouls, and centaurs and nymphs and demons, and dragons and snakes and supernatural birds, and the several classes of the ancestors; [*38*] and lightning, thunderbolts, and clouds, straight rainbows and curved rainbows, comets, whirlwinds, and meteors, and the higher and lower celestial lights; [*39*] quasi-men, monkeys, fish, and various kinds of birds, livestock, wild animals and humans, beasts of prey, (and) animals with two rows of teeth; [*40*] worms, bugs, and moths, lice, flies, and maggots, mosquitoes and gnats, and various stationary things.

[*41*] Thus this whole (universe), stationary and moving, was created by those great-souled ones at my command through the use of inner heat – each according to its own innate activity. [*42*] I will tell you now what sort of innate activity each sort of living being here is said to have, and also their order according to their birth.

[*43*] Livestock and wild animals, beasts of prey and animals with two rows of teeth, ogres, ghouls, and humans, are born from an embryonic sac. [*44*] Birds, snakes, crocodiles, fish, turtles, and various other species of this sort born on land or in water are born from eggs. [*45*] Mosquitoes and gnats, lice, flies, and maggots, and other species of this sort which originate from heat are born of sweat. [*46*] All the stationary (plants) that grow from the seed or node are born from shoots; herbs are those that bear many flowers and fruits and then die with the ripening of the fruit. [*47*] (Trees) that have fruit but no flowers are traditionally known as Lords of the Forest; those that bear both flowers and fruit are called trees. [*48*] The various sorts of (plants that have) one root and those with many roots, the different species of grasses, and climbing vines and creepers all grow from a seed or a shoot. [*49*] Enveloped by a darkness that has many forms and is the result of their own innate activities, they have an internal consciousness and experience happiness and unhappiness. [*50*] In this terrible cycle of transmigration of living beings, which moves relentlessly on and on, the levels of existence are said to begin with Brahmā and to end with them.

[*51*] When the one whose prowess cannot be imagined had thus emitted this whole (universe), and me, he vanished once again into

himself, pressing time against time. [52] For when the god awakens, this universe moves; and when he sleeps, and his soul is at rest, then everything closes its eyes. [53] And when he is fast asleep, embodied beings, whose souls are conditioned by their innate activities, cease from their own innate activities, and the mind-and-heart becomes faint. [54] And when, all at the same time, they are dissolved into that great soul, then the one who is the soul of all living beings turns back and sleeps happily. [55] Lodging in darkness, he remains there with the sensory powers for a long time and does not engage in his own innate activity; and then he moves out from that physical form. [56] He becomes the size of an atomic particle and enters into the seed of what moves and of what is still; and when he has united (with that) he leaves his (former) physical form. [57] Thus by means of waking and sleeping the imperishable one brings to life this whole (universe), moving and unmoving, and tirelessly destroys it.

[58] When he had made this teaching, he himself first made me grasp it according to the rules, and I taught it to Marīci and the other hermits. [59] Bhṛgu, here, will let you hear this teaching and leave nothing out; for that hermit came to understand it all, in its entirety, from me.

[60] When Manu had spoken to the great sage Bhṛgu in this way, Bhrgu's soul rejoiced and he said to all the sages,

Listen! [61] There are six other Manus in the dynasty of that Manu who was born of the Self-existent (Brahmā); they have great souls and great energy and each emitted his own progeny. [62] They are the sons of 'Self-luminous', 'Uppermost', 'Dark', 'Wealthy', 'Gazing', and the radiant son of 'the Shining Sun'. [63] These seven Manus, beginning with the one born of the Self-existent (Brahmā), abound in brilliant energy; each one, in his own Epoch, created and pervaded this whole (universe), moving and unmoving.

[64] Eighteen blinks of an eye make up a period called a 'race-course', and thirty 'race-courses' make up one 'fraction'; thirty 'fractions' constitute a 'moment', and the same number (of 'moments') make up. a day and a night. [65] The sun separates day and night, both for human beings and for gods; the night is for living beings to sleep, and the day is for them to move about in their activity. [66] A (human) month is a day and night for the ancestors, and it is divided into two lunar fortnights: the dark (fortnight) is the day for them to move about in their activity and the bright (fortnight) is the night for their sleep. [67] A (human) year is a day and night for the gods, and it too is divided into two parts: when the sun goes north it is their day, and when it goes south it is their night.

[*68*] Now learn, in summary, the measure of the night and day of Brahmā, and of the Ages, one by one, in order. [*69*] It is said that the Winning Age lasts for four thousand years; the twilight (preceding it) lasts for the same number of hundreds (of years), and the partial twilight (following it) is the same size. [*70*] In the three other (Ages) with their twilights and their partial twilights, the thousands and hundreds (of years) are calculated by subtracting one (from each progressive Age). [*71*] This period of four Ages, lasting for twelve thousand years, that has been enumerated first, is said to be an Age of the gods. [*72*] But the sum of a thousand Ages of the gods is known as a single day of Brahmā, and a night (of Brahmā) is exactly as long. [*73*] Those who know about days and nights know that an excellent day of Brahmā ends after a thousand Ages, and a night is exactly as long. [*74*] At the end of his day and night, the sleeper awakens, and when he is awake he emits mind-and-heart, the essence of what is real and unreal.

[*75*] Driven by the desire to create, mind-and-heart transforms creation; the ether is produced from that, and sound is known as the quality of the ether. [*76*] From the ether as it transforms itself comes the unpolluted and powerful wind, the vehicle of all odours, which is regarded as having the quality of touch. [*77*] From wind, as it also transforms itself, comes light, shining and brilliant and dispelling darkness, and said to have the quality of form. [*78*] And from light as it transforms itself come the waters, which are traditionally known to have the quality of taste; and from the waters comes earth, with the quality of smell. This is the creation in the beginning.

[*79*] The Age of the gods, which was mentioned before, lasts for twelve thousand (years); when it is multiplied by seventy-one it is called an Epoch of a Manu. [*80*] The Epochs of a Manu are countless, and so are the emissions and reabsorptions (of the universe); as if he were playing, the Supreme Lord does this again and again. [*81*] In the Winning Age, religion is entire, standing on all four feet, and so is truth; and men do not acquire any gain through irreligion. [*82*] But in the other (Ages), through (such wrong) gains, religion is brought down foot by foot; and because of theft, lying, and deceit, religion goes away foot by foot. [*83*] In the Winning Age, (people) are free from sickness, achieve all their goals, and (have) a lifespan of four hundred years; but in the Ages that begin with the Age of the Trey, their lifespan grows smaller foot by foot.

[*84*] The lifespan of mortals, which is mentioned in the Veda, the realized hopes of innate activities, and the special power of embodied beings bear fruit in the world according to the Age. [*85*] The religious duties of men are different in the Winning Age and in the Age of the Trey and the Age of the Deuce; they are different in the Losing Age, in

proportion with the decrease of each Age. [*86*] Inner heat is said to be paramount in the Winning Age, and knowledge in the Age of the Trey; they say that sacrifice (is paramount) in the Age of the Deuce, and the one thing in the Losing Age is giving.

[*87*] But to protect this whole creation, the lustrous one made separate innate activities for those born of his mouth, arms, thighs, and feet. [*88*] For priests, he ordained teaching and learning, sacrificing for themselves and sacrificing for others, giving and receiving. [*89*] Protecting his subjects, giving, having sacrifices performed, studying, and remaining unaddicted to the sensory objects are, in summary, for a ruler. [*90*] Protecting his livestock, giving, having sacrifices performed, studying, trading, lending money, and farming the land are for a commoner. [*91*] The Lord assigned only one activity to a servant: serving these (other) classes without resentment.

[*92*] A man is said to be purer above the navel; therefore the Self-existent one said that his mouth was the purest part of him. [*93*] The priest is the Lord of this whole creation, according to the law, because he was born of the highest part of the body, because he is the eldest, and because he maintains the Veda. [*94*] The Self-existent one emitted him from his own mouth, first, when he had generated inner heat, to convey the offerings to the gods and the ancestors, and to guard this whole (creation). [*95*] What living being is greater than him? For it is through his mouth that those (gods) who live in the triple heaven always eat their offerings, and the ancestors (eat) their offerings. [*96*] The best of living beings are those that have the breath of life; and (the best) of those that have the breath of life are those that live by their intelligence; the best of those that have intelligence are men; and priests are traditionally regarded as (the best) of men. [*97*] Among priests, learned men (are the best); among learned men, those who understand their obligations; among those who understand their obligations, those who fulfil them; and among those who fulfil them, those who know the Veda.

[*98*] The very birth of a priest is the eternal physical form of religion; for he is born for the sake of religion and is fit to become one with ultimate reality. [*99*] For when a priest is born he is born at the top of the earth, as the lord of all living beings, to guard the treasure of religion. [*100*] All of this belongs to the priest, whatever there is in the universe; the priest deserves all of this because of his excellence and his high birth. [*101*] The priest eats only what is his own, he wears what is his own, and he gives what is his own; other people eat through the priest's mercy.

[*102*] To distinguish the (priest's) innate activity and those of the rest (of the classes) in their order, the wise Manu, son of the Self-existent, made this teaching. [*103*] A learned priest – but no one else –

should study it carefully and explain it to his pupils properly. [*104*] A priest who studies this teaching and has fulfilled his vow is not constantly smeared with the faults of the effects of past actions born of mind-and-heart, speech, and body. [*105*] He purifies the rows for seven generations in the past and seven in the future; and he alone deserves this entire earth. [*106*] This (teaching) is the best support for well-being; it increases intelligence; it is conducive to fame, long life, and the supreme good.

[*107*] This (teaching) describes religion in its entirety, as well as the virtues and vices of the effects of past actions and the eternal rule of conduct for the four classes. [*108*] The rule of conduct, the highest law, is described both in the revealed canon and in tradition; therefore a twice-born person who is self-possessed should always engage in it. [*109*] A priest who has slipped from (proper) conduct does not reap the fruit of the Veda; but one who is engaged in (proper) conduct is traditionally said to enjoy the full fruit. [*110*] When the hermits saw that the course of religion thus comes from (proper) conduct, they understood that (proper) conduct was the ultimate root of all inner heat.

[*111*] In this teaching, Manu has declared the origin of the universe and the rules for the transformative rituals, the carrying out of vows and attendance upon (a teacher) and the ultimate rule for the graduation bath; [*112*] the taking of a wife and the mark of (different kinds of) marriages, the regulations for the great sacrifices and the obligatory rule of the ceremonies for the dead; [*113*] the mark of the (various) means of livelihood, the vows of a Vedic graduate, what is to be eaten and not to be eaten, purification and the cleansing of things; [*114*] the application of the duties of women, the rules for the generation of inner heat, Freedom, and renunciation, all the duties of a king, and decision-making in lawsuits; [*115*] the regulations for questioning witnesses; the duties of husband and wife; the law for the division (of inheritances), gambling, and ‘cleaning out thorns’; [*116*] attendance by commoners and servants, and the origin of confused classes; the religious duties of (all) classes in extremity, and the rules for restorations; [*117*] the threefold course of transmigration that arises from the effects of past actions; the supreme good, and the examination of the virtues and vices of the effects of past actions; [*118*] the obligatory duties of (particular) countries, castes, and families; and the duties of sects of heretics.

[*119*] Learn this teaching, all of you, from me today, just as Manu told it to me long ago when I asked him.

End of Chapter 1

[2] Here and throughout this translation, ‘duty’ will always be a translation of *dharma*, though other English renderings for *dharma* (such as ‘religion’, ‘justice’, ‘law’, and ‘right’) will also be used. See the discussion of *dharma* in the introduction and the range of meanings given in the glossary under *dharma*. The classes (*varṇas*) are described at 1.31ff.

[5] This passage is roughly based upon the great ṛg Vedic creation hymn, RV 10.129, and agrees in many particulars with creation accounts in the *Mahābhārata*, such as 12.187, 224–6, and 239–40. It expresses the philosophy of the Sānkhya school.

[6] The great elements, consisting of the five gross elements (ether, wind, light, water, and earth) and the sixth, the great element of mind, are described in greater detail at 1.75–8.

[7] The five sensory powers of perception (*indriyas*) are both the senses (sight, hearing, smell, taste, and touch) and the sense organs (eye, ear, nose, tongue, and skin). They, and the five motor powers, are described at 2.90–91.

[11] The Man is *puruṣa*, the primeval spirit.

[14] The term *manas* designates the organ that the Hindus regard as the seat of both reason and emotion; since we separate these capacities into mind and heart, we need ‘mind-and-heart’ to render the Sanskrit.

[15] The great one is often identified with the supreme soul or *paramātman*. The qualities or characteristics (Sanskrit: *guṇas*) are the three constituent ‘strands’ of matter, entwined together like a braid: darkness or torpor (*tamas*), energy or passion (*rajas*), and lucidity or goodness (*sattva*).

[16] The six are the five sense organs and the mind, or the six elements.

[17] This verse depends upon an etymological pun that connects ‘they embody’ (more literally, ‘inhabit’ [Sanskrit *āśrayanti*]) with ‘the body’ (*śarīra*).

[19] The term Man (Sanskrit *puruṣa*, also translated as Male or Person) usually refers to a single divine figure, as in 1.11. Here, however, it is extended, apparently metaphorically, to the six elements or the six senses. The concept of seven Men (*puruṣas*) as elements of a single person (*puruṣas*) occurs at *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* 6.1.1.3, 6.

[20] Thus, for instance, the third element, light, has three qualities: its own and the qualities of wind and ether that precede it.

[21] Innate activities (*karmans*) here designate different courses of action (‘those that should be done and those that should not be done’, or ‘the proper activity of a priest versus the proper activity of a ruler’), or different sorts of rituals, or good and evil action (‘performing a horse sacrifice versus killing a priest’, as one commentary puts it), or *karmans* in the more technical sense of the accumulated consequences of past actions.

[22] The Amenables are the *sādhyas*, a class of gods.

[26] ‘Right’ and ‘wrong’ render *dharma* and *adharma*.

[31] These are the four classes or *varṇas* of Hindu society: priests (Brahmins), rulers or warrior kings (Kṣatriyas), the common people (Vaiśyas), and servants (Śūdras). Their creation from the mouth and other parts of the primordial Man (*puruṣa*) is described in ṛg *Veda* 10.90.

[32] Several commentaries say that this Virāj was a human male; he may have been a demigod.

[36] The Manus are the creators, each of whom presides over an Epoch of a Manu (*manvantara*).

[37] Here, and throughout, the following terms are used to translate what are in fact untranslatable names of particular classes of creatures: genies (*yakṣas*, servants of Kubera, the god of wealth), ogres (*rākṣasas*), ghouls (*piśācas*), nymphs (*apsarases*, heavenly dancers and courtesans in the court of Indra, king of the gods), demons (more properly anti-gods: *asuras*), centaurs (Gandharvas, demigods associated with

horses, music, and fertility, the male consorts of the celestial nymphs), and dragons (Nāgas, demigods, often serpents from the waist down, who inhabit the subterranean watery worlds).

[39] Quasi-men (*kinnaras*, literally, 'What?men') may be a species of ape. In the mythology, they are said to be creatures with the heads of horses and bodies of humans, or, occasionally, the heads of humans and the bodies of horses. The animals with two rows of teeth are equines.

[45] These insects are born of *sveda*, literally sweat, and may indeed be born of sweat, though *sveda* may also mean steam and is usually taken in that sense in this context.

[51] Some commentaries suggest that Brahmā pushes out a period of creation by means of a period of doomsday; others, that he pushes out a time of happiness with a time of unhappiness, and a time of unhappiness with a time of happiness.

[52] There is a pun here on the word for universe (*jagat*, which actually means 'moving, in motion') and the verb to awaken or be awake (*jāgarti*).

[53] 'Mind-and-heart' might refer to the mind-and-heart of these creatures or to the mind-and-heart as the great element in the universe.

[55] This and the following sentence seem to describe simultaneously two parallel processes: 'he' is the Lord who sheds the universe, moving and still, at the time of doomsday, but 'he' may also be the individual transmigrating soul, who, in these two sentences, sheds his physical form in something moving (animal) or still (vegetable) in preparation for uniting with a new physical form.

[62] The son of 'Self-luminous' is *svārociṣa*, of 'Uppermost' is *auttami*, of 'Dark' is *tāmasa*, of 'Wealthy' is *raivata*, of 'Gazing' is *cākṣuṣa*, and 'the Shining Sun' is *vivasvant*.

[64] A blink of the eye is a *nimeśa*, about .18 seconds; a 'race-course' is a *kāṣṭhā*, 3.2 seconds; a 'fraction' is a *kalā*, 1.6 minutes; a 'moment' is a *muhūrta*, 48 minutes. And thirty 'moments' make a 24-hour period of day and night.

[68] The Winning Age is the *kṛta yuga*; the Age of the Trey, the *tretā yuga*; the Age of the Deuce, the *dvāpara yuga*; and the Losing Age, the *kali yuga*. Where Western tradition names the four Ages after metals, the Indian system names them after throws of the dice. Dice are important in ancient India both as a metaphor for chance and as an actual element in the ceremony of royal consecration.

[81] Religion (here rendering *dharma*) stands firm, four-square, like the four-footed bull in 8.16. These four feet (or four quarters) may represent the four classes, the four virtues (as in 5.76), or any or all of a number of other important quartets.

[82] That is, a quarter of religion departs in each age after the Winning Age.

[84] Innate activities here may also designate good actions or ritual actions.

[97] *Brahman* may designate the Veda or ultimate reality.

[101] The word *ānṛśaṃsya*, literally 'lack of cruelty', is often translated as 'mercy'.

[105] The rows (*panktis*) are the group invited to eat at the funeral celebration, constituting acceptable society, defined in 3.151–68. The seven generations on each side are the group connected through the offerings in the ceremony for the dead.

[106] The supreme good (*niḥśreyasam param*) is, literally, that which has no better, a term that generally refers to the knowledge that leads to Freedom.

[111] The phrase 'In this teaching, Manu has declared' actually occurs at the end of the list, in verse 1.117; it has been moved up to the beginning of the list as it would appear in English.

[115] 'Cleaning out thorns' is a euphemism for the extermination of dissidents and other criminal types.

[118] 'Sects' (*gaṇas*) in this context seems to refer to bands or castes of heretics (*pāṣaṇḍas*, mentioned in this verse), outcasts (*apasadas*), outlaws (*vrātyas*, literally 'Men of (Unorthodox) Vows'), and other despised individuals, such as are discussed in Chapter 10, rather than to guilds of merchants (which is what the commentators

suggest). Heretics are not in fact discussed in any single part of this text, but they are referred to on several occasions, often in association with outcasts, men fallen from caste, and various religious hypocrites.

CHAPTER 2

[*1*] Learn the religion that is constantly followed and assented to in the heart by learned men, good men who have neither hatred nor passion.

[*2*] Acting out of desire is not approved of, but here on earth there is no such thing as no desire; for even studying the Veda and engaging in the rituals enjoined in the Veda are based upon desire. [*3*] Desire is the very root of the conception of a definite intention, and sacrifices are the result of that intention; all the vows and the duties of restriction are traditionally said to come from the conception of a definite intention. [*4*] Not a single rite is ever performed here on earth by a man without desire; for each and every thing that he does is motivated by the desire for precisely that thing. [*5*] The man who is properly occupied in these (desires) goes to the world of the immortals, and here on earth he achieves all the desires for which he has conceived an intention.

[*6*] The root of religion is the entire Veda, and (then) the tradition and customs of those who know (the Veda), and the conduct of virtuous people, and what is satisfactory to oneself. [*7*] Whatever duty Manu proclaimed for whatever person, all of that was declared in the Veda, for it contains all knowledge. [*8*] So when a learned man has looked thoroughly at all of this with the eye of knowledge, he should devote himself to his own duty in accordance with the authority of the revealed canon. [*9*] For the human being who fulfils the duty declared in the revealed canon and in tradition wins renown here on earth and unsurpassable happiness after death. [*10*] The Veda should be known as the revealed canon, and the teachings of religion as the tradition. These two are indisputable in all matters, for religion arose out of the two of them. [*11*] Any twice-born man who disregards these two roots (of religion) because he relies on the teachings of logic should be excommunicated by virtuous people as an atheist and a reviler of the Veda.

[*12*] The Veda, tradition, the conduct of good people, and what is pleasing to oneself – they say that this is the four-fold mark of religion, right before one's eyes. [*13*] The knowledge of religion is prescribed for those who are not attached to profit and pleasure; the revealed canon is the supreme authority for those who wish to understand religion. [*14*] But where the revealed canon is divided, both (views) are traditionally regarded as law; for wise men say that both of them are valid laws. [*15*] (For example), the sacrifice is performed at all times – when the sun has risen, when it has not risen, and at the very juncture of daybreak: this is what the revealed Vedic

canon says. [*16*] The man whose ritual life, beginning with the infusion (of semen) and ending with cremation, is dictated by Vedic verses should be recognized as entitled to (study) this teaching, but not anyone else.

[*17*] The country that the gods made between the two divine rivers, the Sarasvatī and the Dṛṣasadvatī, is what they call the Land of Veda. [*18*] The conduct of the (four) classes and intermediary classes in that country, handed down from one person to another, is called the conduct of good people. [*19*] The Field of the Kurus, the Matsyas, Pañcālas, and Sūrasenakas constitute the Country of Priestly Sages, right next to the Land of the Veda. [*20*] All humans on earth should learn their own individual practices from a priest from that country. [*21*] The country between the Himālayas and the Vindhya mountains, to the east of the 'Disappearance' and to the west of Prayāga, is known as the Middle Country. [*22*] From the eastern sea to the western sea, the area in between the two mountains is what wise men call the Land of the Aryans. [*23*] Where the black antelope ranges by nature, that should be known as the country fit for sacrifices; and beyond it is the country of the barbarians. [*24*] The twice-born should make every effort to settle in these countries; but a servant may live in any country at all if he is starved for a livelihood.

[*25*] The source of religion has thus been proclaimed to you concisely, and the origin of this whole (universe); now learn the duties of the classes.

[*26*] The transformative rituals for the bodies of the twice-born, beginning with the rite of the infusion (of semen), which purify them here on earth and after death, should be performed with excellent Vedic rites. [*27*] The offerings into the fire for the embryo, the birth rites, the ceremonial haircut and the tying of the belt of rushes, wipe away from the twice-born the guilt of the seed and the guilt of the womb. [*28*] By the study of the Veda, by vows, by offerings into the fire, by acquiring the triple learning, by offering sacrifices, by sons, and by the great sacrifices and the (other) sacrifices, this body is made fit for ultimate reality. [*29*] Before the umbilical cord of a male child is cut, the birth rite is performed; and he eats gold, honey, and butter with the Vedic verses.

[*30*] The name-giving should be done for him on the tenth day (after birth) or the twelfth day, or on an excellent lunar day or moment, or under a constellation that has good qualities. [*31*] (The name) of a priest should have (a word for) auspiciousness, of a ruler strength, of a commoner property, and (the name) of a servant should breed disgust. [*32*] The name of a priest should have (a word for) secure comfort, of a king it should have protection, of a commoner it should be connected with prosperity, and of a servant it should be

connected with service. [*33*] (The names) of women should be easy to pronounce, not harsh, of patent meaning, and auspicious; they should captivate the mind-and-heart, end in a long vowel, and contain a word for blessings. [*34*] The child's (ceremony of) going out from the house should be performed in the fourth month; his eating of food, or whatever auspicious ceremony is preferred in the family, in the sixth month. [*35*] The ceremonial haircut of all the twice-born is to be done in the first year or in the third year, according to law and the command of the revealed canon.

[*36*] The ceremony of initiation should be performed in the eighth year after (the conception of) the embryo of a priest; in the eleventh year after (the conception of) the embryo of a king, and in the twelfth year after (the conception of) the embryo of a commoner. [*37*] For a priest who desires the splendour of the Veda it is to be done in the fifth year; for a king who seeks strength, in the sixth; and for a commoner who is ambitious, in the eighth. [*38*] The (time for the first teaching of the) verse to the sun-god does not expire until the sixteenth year for a priest; until the twenty-second, for a member of the ruling class; and until the twenty-fourth for a commoner. [*39*] After that, if these three (classes) have not undergone the transformative rituals at the proper time, they lose their chance of learning the verse to the sun-god and become outlaws, despised by Aryans. [*40*] A priest should never, even in extremity, forge Vedic or sexual bonds with these people who have not been purified.

[*41*] Chaste students of the Veda should wear, in (descending) order of class, the skins of a black antelope, gazelle, and male goat, and hemp, linen, and wool. [*42*] The belt of a priest should be made of smooth, three-ply rushes; of a ruler, it should be a bowstring of hemp fibre; and of a commoner, a thread of hemp. [*43*] If rushes are unattainable, the belts should be made of sacrificial grass, 'stone-tipped' grass or coarse grass, triple-ply, with one knot, or three, or five. [*44*] The initiatory thread of a priest should be made of cotton, put on above (the right shoulder), three-ply; of a ruler it should be made of hemp threads, and of a commoner it should be of wool threads.

[*45*] A priest's staff should be made of wood-apple and the 'straw-eating' plant; a ruler's, of banyan and acacia; a commoner's, of palm and fig, according to law. [*46*] The staff of a priest should be long enough to reach his hair; of a king it should reach his forehead, and of a commoner the tip of his nose. [*47*] All of these should be straight, without blemish, and nice to look at. They should not be alarming to men, they should still have their bark, and they should not be spoiled by fire.

[*48*] When he has taken up a staff that he likes, he should stand

facing the sun, go around the fire clockwise, and then go begging, in accordance with the rules. [*49*] When a priest who has been initiated goes begging, he should say 'Sir (or Madam)' at the beginning; a ruler should say 'Sir (or Madam)' in the middle; and a commoner should say 'Sir (or Madam)' at the end. [*50*] He should beg first from his mother or his sister or from his own mother's sister, or (from a woman) who will not refuse him. [*51*] When he has collected sufficient food from begging, he should inform his guru without deceit, purify himself by rinsing his mouth, and then eat, facing east.

[*52*] For facing east he eats food that gives long life; south, fame; west, good fortune; north, truth. [*53*] A twice-born man should always eat food with a concentrated mind, after he has washed; and when he has eaten he should wash thoroughly, and wash out the orifices of his body with water. [*54*] He should always respect food, and eat without criticizing it; when he sees it he should rejoice and be thankful, and welcome it altogether. [*55*] For food that has been respected always gives strength and vigour; but food eaten without respect destroys both of them. [*56*] He should not give the leftovers to anyone, nor should he eat between meals; he should not overeat, nor go anywhere with food still on his mouth and hands. [*57*] Overeating is not conducive to health, long life, or heaven; it destroys merit and people hate it; therefore it should be avoided.

[*58*] A priest should wash all the time with the 'ford' (of the hand) named for Brahmā, or with the one for Ka, or the one for the Thirty (gods), but never with the one for the ancestors. [*59*] They call what is on the surface of the root of the thumb the 'ford' of Brahmā; what is at the root of the (little) finger (the ford) of Ka; what is at the tip (of the fingers, the 'ford') of the gods; and what is below those two (the 'ford') of the ancestors. [*60*] First he should rinse his mouth three times with water and wipe his mouth twice. Then he should wash the orifices of his body with water, as well as (the seat of) his soul and his head. [*61*] A man who knows the law and desires purification should always rinse his mouth with water that is neither hot nor foamy, using the (correct) 'ford' (of the hand), facing east, in a solitary place. [*62*] A priest is purified by water that reaches up to his heart, a king by (water) up to his neck, a commoner by (water) that is swallowed, and a servant by (water) touched on the tip (of his lips).

[*63*] A twice-born man is said to be 'wearing the initiatory thread' when his right hand is lifted up; he is said to be 'wearing the initiatory thread to the front' when his left hand is lifted up and 'wearing the initiatory thread down' when it hangs down from his neck. [*64*] He should throw his belt, animal skin, staff, initiatory thread, and water-pot into the water when they are worn out and take others, while chanting Vedic verses. [*65*] The final haircut should be performed for

a priest in the sixteenth year, for a member of the ruling class in the twenty-second year, and for a commoner in two more years.

[*66*] For women, this cycle should be performed without Vedic verses, leaving nothing else out, at the proper time and in the proper order, to perfect the body. [*67*] The ritual of marriage is traditionally known as the Vedic transformative ritual for women; serving her husband is (the equivalent of) living with a guru, and household chores are the rites of the fire.

[*68*] The rule of the initiation of the twice-born, which makes manifest a birth and gives merit, has thus been explained; now learn about the performance of rituals.

[*69*] When the guru has initiated the pupil, he should first teach him about purification, conduct, the tending of the fire, and the twilight ceremonies. [*70*] As (the pupil) is about to recite, he should rinse out his mouth according to the teachings, face the north, cup his hands in homage to the Veda, dress simply, and conquer his sensory powers, and then he is fit to be taught. [*71*] At the beginning and at the end of (reciting) the Veda, he should always clasp his guru's feet; he should join his hands together when he recites, for that is traditionally regarded as cupping the hands in homage to the Veda. [*72*] He should clasp his guru's (feet) with crossed hands, touching the left (foot) with the left (hand), and the right with the right. [*73*] The guru, never tiring, should say to him as he is about to begin his recitation, 'Now, recite!' and he should stop him by saying, 'Now, stop.'

[*74*] He should always say, 'Om!' at the beginning and at the end of (reciting) the Veda, for (the recitation) slips away without 'Om' before it and dissolves (without 'Om') after it. [*75*] Sitting (on sacrificial grass) with the tips pointing east, purified by the purifying (grasses) and by suppressing his breath three times, he is fit to say, 'Om!' [*76*] The Lord of Creatures milked out of the three Vedas the syllables 'a', 'u', and 'm', and (the exclamations) 'Bhūḥ!', 'Bhuvaḥ!' and 'Svaḥ!', [*77*] And the Lord of Creatures, the supreme lord, milked out of the three Vedas, taking one foot from each (Veda), the ṛg Vedic verse to the sun-god that begins, 'That excellent (light) of Savitṛ.' [*78*] A priest who knows the Veda and who chants that syllable and that verse, preceded by the exclamations, at the two twilights, gains the merit of (reciting the whole) Veda. [*79*] And a twice-born man who repeats this triad a thousand times outside (the village) for a month is freed even from a great error, like a snake from its sloughed skin.

[*80*] A priest, ruler, or commoner who does not have this ṛg Vedic verse and his own rites performed at the right time becomes an object of contempt among virtuous people. [*81*] It should be recognized that

the three great and imperishable exclamations, preceded by the syllable 'Om', together with the three feet of the verse to the sun-god, are the mouth of the Veda. [*82*] Anyone who recites that verse for three years, tirelessly, day after day, becomes wind, takes on a physical form made of air, and reaches the ultimate reality. [*83*] That monosyllable is the ultimate reality, and breath-suppression is the ultimate generation of inner heat; but there is nothing beyond the verse to the sun-god; truth is better than silence. [*84*] All the Vedic rituals, the oblations and the sacrifices, perish, but it should be realized that the syllable does not perish; it is ultimate reality and the Lord of Creatures.

[*85*] A sacrifice that consists of chanting ('Om' and the verse to the sun-god) is ten times better than a sacrifice performed in accordance with the rules; if inaudible, it is a hundred times better, and if (merely) mental it is traditionally regarded as a thousand (times better). [*86*] The four domestic sacrifices and the sacrifices (performed) in accordance with the rules all together are not worth a sixteenth part of the sacrifice that consists of chanting. [*87*] But a priest achieves perfect success merely by chanting; there is no doubt about this. Whether or not he does any other (ritual), a man who befriends (all creatures) is called a true priest.

[*88*] A learned man should keep trying hard to restrain his sensory powers as they run amok among alluring sensory objects, like a charioteer (restraining) his race-horses. [*89*] I will explain, thoroughly and in order, the eleven sensory powers that wise men of ancient times spoke of: [*90*] the ear, the skin, the eyes, the tongue, and the nose as the fifth; the anus, the genitals, the hand and foot, and (the organ of) speech is traditionally regarded as the tenth. [*91*] The five beginning with the ear are the senses; the five beginning with the anus are the motor powers. [*92*] The eleventh is known as the mind-and-heart, which belongs to both (sets) by virtue of its own qualities; when it has been conquered, both of these sets of five have been conquered. [*93*] Through the addiction of his sensory powers, a man certainly makes mistakes; but if he firmly restrains them all, he will achieve success. [*94*] Desire is never extinguished by the enjoyment of what is desired; it just grows stronger, like a fire that flares up with the oblation (of butter) and burns a dark path.

[*95*] Someone may attain all of these (desires) and someone may reject them all, but the rejection of all desires is better than the attainment. [*96*] Those (sensory powers) that take voluptuous pleasure in the sensory objects cannot be restrained by non-indulgence so well as by constant understanding. [*97*] The Vedas, rejection (of desires), sacrifices, restraints, the generation of inner heat – they never bring perfect success to a man whose nature has been corrupted.

[*98*] A man who neither thrills nor recoils when he hears, touches, sees, tastes, or smells anything – he should be known as a man who has conquered his sensory powers. [*99*] But if a single one of all the sensory powers slips away, through that his wits slip away, like water from one foot of a leather water-bag. [*100*] If he keeps the whole cluster of sensory powers in control, and his mind-and-heart as well, he may achieve success in all his goals, without wasting away his body through harnessing (his energies).

[*101*] He should stand and chant the verse to the sun-god during the morning twilight until he sees the sun, and he should sit (and chant it) during the evening twilight until the constellations appear clearly. [*102*] When he stands and chants during the morning twilight he dispels the guilt of the night, and when he sits (and chants) during the evening twilight he destroys the dirty deed done during the day. [*103*] But the man who neither stands (and chants) in the morning nor sits (and chants) in the evening should be excommunicated from every ritual of the twice-born, just like a servant. [*104*] A man who is engaged in an obligatory ritual may even go into the wilderness and recite the verse to the sun-god near water, restrained and with a concentrated mind.

[*105*] It is not necessary to comply with any reason for interruption when one is studying the supplementary texts of the Veda, or reciting the obligatory texts or the Vedic verses for the offerings into the fire. [*106*] There is no reason to interrupt the recitation of the obligatory texts, since it is traditionally regarded as an extended sacrifice consisting of (the daily recitation of) the Veda, in which the Veda is used as the oblation in place of the burnt offering and which gives merit even when a cause for interruption takes the place of the final exclamation of 'Vaṣaṭ!'. [*107*] When a man who is unpolluted and restrained recites (the Veda) privately for a year in accordance with the rule, this makes milk and yogurt, butter and honey flow for him constantly.

[*108*] A twice-born man who has been initiated should put fuel on the fire, go begging, sleep on the ground, and do what is good for his guru, until his homecoming. [*109*] These ten may be instructed, according to the law: the teacher's son or one's own, anyone who gives knowledge or money, a man who is religious, virtuous, obedient, unpolluted, trustworthy, or capable (of learning). [*110*] A person should not speak to anyone unless questioned, nor speak to anyone who questions improperly; for even if he understands, an intelligent man will behave among people like an idiot. [*111*] If someone speaks wrongly and someone questions wrongly, one of the two of them will die or incur (the other's) hatred. [*112*] Learning should not be sown where there is neither religion nor profit, nor at least suitable

obedience, just as good seed (should not be sown) on salt soil. [*113*] Even in terrible extremity, it is better for someone who expounds the Veda to die along with his learning than to sow it on barren ground. [*114*] Learning went up to a priest and said, 'I am your treasure-chest. Save me. Do not give me to anyone who resents me, and I will have the most manly power. [*115*] Tell me to a priest whom you know to be unpolluted, restrained, chaste, and not careless, who will protect the treasure.' [*116*] But anyone who acquires the Veda without permission from someone who is reciting it is a thief of the Veda and goes to hell.

[*117*] First, (the student) should greet the man from whom he receives knowledge, speaking of worldly matters, of the Veda, or of the soul. [*118*] A priest who has curbed himself well is better, even if all he knows is the verse to the sun-god, than a man who is not curbed, who eats everything and sells everything, even if he knows the three Vedas. [*119*] A man should not sit down on a bed or a chair that is occupied by his superior, and a man who is sitting on a bed or a chair should rise to greet his superior. [*120*] For a young man's vital breath rises up and out when an elder approaches him, but he gets it back again by rising to greet him. [*121*] Four things increase and thrive for a man who habitually greets older people and always treats them well: long life, religious merit, fame, and strength.

[*122*] After the greeting, a priest addressing an older person should proclaim his own name: 'I am—' followed by his name. [*123*] To people who do not understand the greeting when the name is given, a wise man should say, 'It is I'; and he should say the same to all women. [*124*] He should pronounce the word, 'You!' at the end of his own name when he greets someone, for it is traditionally said by the sages that the nature of 'You!' is the same as the nature of all names. [*125*] A priest should be greeted with, 'May you have a long life, good sir'; the vowel 'a' should be spoken at the end of the name and the vowel of the preceding syllable should be extended. [*126*] A priest who does not know how to give a greeting in reply to a greeting should not be greeted by a learned man; he is just like a servant. [*127*] When someone meets a priest he should ask after his welfare, (when he meets) a man of the ruling class (he should ask after) his well-being, a commoner his prosperity, and a servant his health. [*128*] A person who has been consecrated (for a sacrifice) should not be addressed by his name, even if he is younger; but a man who knows law should speak to him after saying, 'Hello, Sir.'

[*129*] Now, to a woman who is another man's wife and not related by birth one should say 'Lady' and 'Good woman', and 'Sister'. [*130*] He should say 'I am (his name)' to his mother's brothers, father's brothers, fathers-in-law, officiating priests, and gurus, and rise to greet

them, (even if they are) younger. [*131*] He should revere his mother's sister, the wife of his mother's brother, his mother-in-law, and his father's sister like a guru's wife, for they are the equal of a guru's wife. [*132*] He should embrace (the feet of) his brother's wife every day if she is of the same class, but he should embrace the wives of relatives and in-laws only on returning from a journey.

[*133*] He should treat his father's sister, his mother's sister, and his own older sister like a mother; but his mother is more important than they are. [*134*] A fellow-citizen is counted as a friend after ten years, a fellow artist after five years, a priest who knows his Veda after three years, but people related by birth after only a little while. [*135*] A ten-year-old priest and a hundred-year-old ruler should be regarded as father and son, and of the two of them the priest is the father. [*136*] Wealth, kinship, age, actions, and, fifth, learning are the basis for respect, and each is more important than the one before it. [*137*] Whoever has these five in quantity and quality is worthy of respect among the three (twice-born) classes, and even a servant if he has entered his tenth (decade). [*138*] A man in a carriage, or one who has entered his tenth (decade), a man who is ill or carrying a burden, a woman, a Vedic graduate, a king, and a bridegroom must be given right of way. [*139*] Of these if they meet, the Vedic graduate and the king should be respected (most); and of the king and the Vedic graduate, the Vedic graduate receives the respect of the king.

[*140*] The twice-born man who initiates the pupil and teaches him the Veda together with the ritual texts and the secret texts is called his teacher. [*141*] But a man who teaches one portion of the Veda or even, again, the subsidiary texts of the Vedas, and does it to make a living, is called the instructor. [*142*] The priest who performs the rituals, beginning with the infusion (of the semen), in accordance with the rules, and feeds (the child his first) food is called the guru. [*143*] The (priest) who is chosen by a man and performs for him the preparation of the sacrificial fires, the domestic sacrifices, and sacrifices such as the 'Praise of Fire', is called his officiating priest.

[*144*] (The teacher) who fills (the pupil's) two ears with the Veda not in vain is to be known as his mother and his father, and he must not act with malice against him. [*145*] The teacher is more important than ten instructors, and the father more than a hundred teachers, but the mother more than a thousand fathers. [*146*] Between the one who gives him birth and the one who gives him the Veda, the one who gives the Veda is the more important father; for a priest's birth through the Veda is everlasting, both here on earth and after death. [*147*] That his mother and father produced him through mutual desire, and he was born in the womb, he should regard as his mere coming into existence. [*148*] But the birth that a teacher who has

crossed to the far shore of the Veda produces for him through the verse to the sun-god, in accordance with the rules, is real, free from old age and free from death. [*149*] And the man who gives him the benefit of the revealed canon, a little or a lot, he too should be known as his guru here, because of that benefit of the revealed canon. [*150*] The priest who brings about the Vedic birth of an older person and who teaches him his own duties becomes his father, according to law, even if he is himself a child.

[*151*] When the poet who was born in the family of the Angirases was still a little child he instructed his ancestors and called them 'My little sons', because he excelled them in knowledge. [*152*] Full of indignation, they asked the gods about the matter, and the gods assembled and said to them, 'The little child spoke to you correctly.' [*153*] For an ignorant man is really a child and the one who gives him the Vedic verses is his father; people call an ignorant man, 'Child', and a person who gives Vedic verses, 'Father'.

[*154*] (Seniority comes) not through years or grey hair or wealth or relatives; the sages established this law: 'The man who has learned the Veda with all of its subsidiary texts is great among us.' [*155*] The seniority of priests comes from knowledge; of rulers, from manly power; of commoners, from wealth in grain; and of servants alone, from birth. [*156*] A man does not become old by virtue of his grey hair; the gods regard as an elder the man who, though young, has learned (the Veda). [*157*] A priest who has not learned (the Veda) is like an elephant made of wood, like a deer made of leather: these three bear nothing but the name. [*158*] As an impotent man produces no fruit in women, as a cow produces no fruit in a cow, and as a gift made to an ignorant man is fruitless, so a priest who does not know the ṛg *Veda* is fruitless.

[*159*] Living beings must be taught what is best for them without violence, and a man who wants to uphold the law should use sweet, smooth speech. [*160*] A man whose speech and mind-and-heart are clean and always properly guarded receives all the fruit of reaching the end of the Veda. [*161*] Even a person in physical distress should not strike where there is a wound, or be malicious to others in thought or action; nor should he use unusual speech that will cause alarm. [*162*] A priest should always be alarmed by adulation as if it were poison and always desire scorn as if it were ambrosia. [*163*] For the man who is scorned sleeps happily, awakes happily, and goes about happily in this world; but the man who scorns perishes.

[*164*] A twice-born man whose soul has been perfected by the transformative rituals in the proper order should, while living with his guru, gradually accumulate the inner heat for the study of the Veda. [*165*] A twice-born man should study the whole Veda, together with

the secret texts, while generating particular forms of inner heat and performing various vows enjoined by the rules. [*166*] If a priest wishes to generate inner heat he should constantly recite just the Veda, for the recitation of the Veda is said to be the supreme form of generation of inner heat for a priest here on earth. [*167*] The twice-born man who recites the Veda privately every day, as well as he can, even while he is wearing a garland, is generating the supreme inner heat, right up to the very tips of his nails.

[*168*] A twice-born man who does not study the Veda but exerts himself doing something else quickly turns into a servant, even while he is alive, and his descendants too. [*169*] According to the command of the revealed canon, the first birth of a twice-born man is from his mother, the second is in the tying of his belt of rushes, and the third is in his consecration for a sacrifice. [*170*] Of these, the birth marked by the tying of the belt of rushes is his Vedic birth, and in it the verse to the sun-god is said to be his mother and the teacher his father. [*171*] They call the teacher the father because he gives the Veda, for one cannot engage in any ritual until the belt of rushes is tied. [*172*] (Until then,) a man should not pronounce any Vedic text except when pouring out the refreshment for the dead, for he is the equal of a servant as long as he has not been born in the Veda.

[*173*] When he has been initiated he should seek instruction in the vows and grasp the Veda in the proper order and following the rules. [*174*] Whatever animal skin, thread, belt, staff, and garment were prescribed (in the initiation) are for his vows, too. [*175*] The chaste student of the Veda who lives with his guru should obey these restraints, completely restraining the cluster of his sensory powers to increase his own inner heat. [*176*] When he has bathed and is unpolluted, he should always make a refreshing libation to the gods, sages, and ancestors, worship the deities, and put fuel on (the sacrificial fire). [*177*] He should avoid honey, meat, perfume, garlands, spices, women, anything that has gone sour, and violence to creatures that have the breath of life; [*178*] anointing (his body with oil), putting make-up on his eyes, wearing shoes, and carrying an umbrella; desire, anger, and greed; dancing, singing, and playing musical instruments; [*179*] gambling, group arguments, gossip, telling lies, looking at women or touching them, and striking another person. [*180*] He should always sleep alone and never shed his semen, for by shedding his semen out of lust he breaks his vow. [*181*] A twice-born chaste student of the Veda who has spilled his semen in his sleep, not out of lust, should bathe, worship the sun, and chant, three times, the Vedic verse that begins, 'Let my sensory power return to me again.'

[*182*] He should fetch a pot of water, flowers, cowdung, clay, and sacrificial grass, as much as are needed, and go begging every day.

[*183*] A chaste student of the Veda, purified, should beg every day from the houses of people who do not fail to perform Vedic sacrifices and who are approved of for carrying out their own innate activities. [*184*] He should not beg from his guru's family nor from the relatives of his mother or father, but if he cannot get to the houses of others he should avoid each of these more than the one that precedes it. [*185*] And if there are none of the people mentioned above, he should beg from the whole village, purified and restrained in his speech, but he should avoid those who have been indicted. [*186*] When he has brought fuel from a distance, he should set it down in the open air, not on the ground, and tirelessly make oblations into the fire with it, morning and evening. [*187*] If he fails to go begging or to put fuel on the fire for seven nights when he is not ill, he should carry out the vow for one who has shed his semen unchastely.

[*188*] When he is under the vow (of a chaste student) he should make his living by begging, nor should he eat the food of just one person; when begging is the livelihood of a person under a vow it is traditionally regarded as equal to fasting. [*189*] If he is invited to a ceremony dedicated to the gods or a ritual for the ancestors, he may eat if he wishes, but like a man under a vow or like a sage, and he must not break his vow. [*190*] Wise men have ordained this ritual activity just for a priest; this ritual activity is not prescribed for a king or a commoner. [*191*] When he is commanded by his guru, or even when he is not commanded, he should constantly harness his energies to study (the Veda) and to do what is good for his teacher. [*192*] Restraining his body, his speech, and his mind-and-heart and senses, he should stand with his hands cupped, looking at his guru's face. [*193*] His hand should always be bare, his conduct virtuous, and (his body) well covered; and when he is told, 'Sit down', he should sit down facing his guru.

[*194*] He should always have worse food, clothing, and ornaments than his guru when he is in his presence, and he should get up earlier and go to rest later. [*195*] He should not listen to or talk with (his guru) while lying on a bed, sitting, eating, or standing with his face turned away. [*196*] He should (listen or talk) standing when (the guru) is seated, walking towards him when he is standing, rising to meet him when he comes towards him, and running after him when he runs, [*197*] facing him when his face is turned away, going closer to him when he stands far away, bending down before him when he lies on a bed or is standing on a lower spot. [*198*] His bed and seat should always be lower than his guru's in his presence, and he should not sit any which way he likes when he is within his guru's range of vision. [*199*] He should not utter his (guru's) mere name alone even when he is out of sight, nor imitate his gait, speech, and movements.

[*200*] Wherever people speak ill of or even reproach his guru, he should cover up both ears or go somewhere else. [*201*] As a result of speaking ill of him, he becomes a donkey, and if he reproaches him he becomes a dog; if he lives off him he becomes a worm, and if he is grudging towards him he becomes a bug. [*202*] He should not honour him while remaining far away from him, nor when (the guru) is angry or in the presence of a woman. If he is in a carriage or on a seat, he should get down and then greet him. [*203*] He should not sit with his guru to the windward or the leeward, and he should not say anything that his guru cannot hear. [*204*] He may sit with his guru in a carriage drawn by an ox, horse, or camel, on a terrace, a bed of leaves or flowers, or a mat, or on a rock, a wooden bench, or a boat. [*205*] When his guru's guru is present, he should treat him like his guru; but he should not greet venerable people in his own family without his guru's permission. [*206*] This is also how he should always treat those who are his gurus because of their learning, who are born of the same womb, who prevent him from acting wrongly, or who give him advice for his own good.

[*207*] He should always treat his betters like his guru, and so too his guru's son when he is a teacher, and his guru's own relatives. [*208*] A guru's son who teaches (the Veda) should receive honour like the guru, whether he is a child or the same age, or (even still) a pupil in the sacrificial ritual. [*209*] (A student) should not massage the limbs of the guru's son, nor bathe him or eat his leftovers, nor wash his feet.

[*210*] The guru's wives who belong to the same class should be revered like the guru, but those who do not belong to the same class should be revered by rising to greet them. [*211*] (The student) should not rub oil on his guru's wife, or bathe her, or massage her limbs, or do her hair. [*212*] When he is fully twenty years old and understands virtues and vices here on earth, he should not greet his guru's young wife by (touching) her feet. [*213*] It is the very nature of women to corrupt men here on earth; for that reason, circumspect men do not get careless and wanton among wanton women. [*214*] It is not just an ignorant man, but even a learned man of the world, too, that a wanton woman can lead astray when he is in the control of lust and anger. [*215*] No one should sit in a deserted place with his mother, sister, or daughter; for the strong cluster of the sensory powers drags away even a learned man. [*216*] But a young man may, if he wishes, prostrate himself on the ground in front of his guru's young wives in accordance with the rules, saying, 'I am (his name)'. [*217*] When he returns from a journey he should embrace the feet of his guru's wives and greet them every day, remembering the duties of good people.

[*218*] Just as a man who digs with a spade discovers water, even so

the obedient (pupil) discovers the learning that is in his guru. [*219*] He may shave his head or keep his hair matted or in a matted crest, but the sun should never close its eyes or rise on him in a village. [*220*] If the sun rises on him or closes its eyes on him when he is lying in bed for pleasure or even unknowingly, he should fast for a day while chanting (the verse to the sun). [*221*] For a man who lies in bed when the sun closes its eyes on him or rises on him, and who does not carry out the restoration, incurs great guilt. [*222*] With a concentrated mind, he should always purify himself by rinsing his mouth and worship the two twilights in an unpolluted place, chanting the prayer that should be chanted in accordance with the rules.

[*223*] If a woman or a man lower born does anything that is better, he should do all of that diligently, and whatever his mind-and-heart delights in. [*224*] Religion and profit are said to be better, or pleasure and profit, or religion alone, or profit alone here on earth; but the fixed rule is that the triple path is best.

[*225*] A teacher, father, mother, and older brother should not be treated with contempt, especially by a priest, not even by someone who has been provoked. [*226*] The teacher is the physical form of ultimate reality, the father the physical form of the Lord of Creatures, the mother the physical form of the earth, and one's own brother the physical form of one's own self. [*227*] The trouble that a mother and father endure in giving birth to human beings cannot be redeemed even in a hundred years. [*228*] He should constantly do what pleases the two of them, and always what pleases his teacher; when those three are satisfied, all inner heat is achieved. [*229*] Obedience to these three is said to be the supreme generation of inner heat; he should not assume any other duties without their permission.

[*230*] For they alone are the three worlds, they alone are the three stages of life, they alone are the three Vedas, and they alone are said to be the three sacrificial fires. [*231*] The father is the householder's fire, and the mother is traditionally regarded as the southern fire; but the guru is the fire for the oblations to the gods; and this is the most important triad of fires. [*232*] The householder who does not neglect these three conquers the three worlds; illuminated by his own body, like a god, he rejoices in heaven. [*233*] By loving devotion to his mother he wins this world; by loving devotion to his father, the middle world; and by obedience to his guru, the world of ultimate reality.

[*234*] A man who has deeply respected these has deeply respected all duties; but all rites are fruitless for the man who has not deeply respected these. [*235*] As long as these three live, he should not undertake any other (duties); he should constantly give them his obedience, taking pleasure in what pleases them and is good for them.

[236] He should inform them about whatever he undertakes, in mind-and-heart, speech, or action, for the sake of the world beyond and without inconvenience to them. [237] For by treating these three in this way a man accomplishes what ought to be done; this is the ultimate duty right before one's eyes, and any other is said to be a subordinate duty.

[238] A man who has faith may receive good learning even from a man who is lower, the ultimate law even from a man of the lowest (castes), and a jewel of a woman even from a bad family. [239] Ambrosia may be extracted even from poison, and good advice even from a child, good behaviour even from an enemy, and gold even from something impure. [240] Women, jewels, learning, law, purification, good advice, and various crafts may be acquired from anybody. [241] In extremity, it is permissible to learn (the Veda) from someone who is not a priest and to walk behind him and obey him like a guru as long as the instruction lasts. [242] If a pupil longs for the ultimate level of existence, he should not live endlessly with a guru who is not a priest or with a priest who does not know the Veda with all of its subsidiary texts.

[243] But if he wishes to live endlessly with the guru's family, he should obey him diligently until he (himself) is freed from his body. [224] A priest who obeys his guru until the body is finished goes straight to the eternal abode of ultimate reality. [245] A man who knows the law should not offer anything to his guru ahead of time, but when he has received his guru's permission (to leave) and is about to take his (graduation) bath he should bring a present for his guru, to the best of his ability: [246] a field, gold, a cow, a horse, or, finally, an umbrella and shoes, grain, clothing, or vegetables, presenting it to please his guru. [247] But if his teacher dies, he should treat his guru's son like a guru, if he has good qualities, or his guru's wife, or a co-feeding relative. [248] If none of these can be found, he should assume (his guru's) place, seat, and business, diligently serving the sacrificial fires, and thus perfect his own body. [249] A priest who behaves like this and does not break his vow as a chaste student of the Veda attains the supreme condition and is not born again here on earth.

End of Chapter 2

[7] The final phrase may also mean, 'for he (Manu) knew everything'.

[11] The atheist is literally a *nāstika* or one who says, 'It is not', 'it' being the world of the gods or heaven.

[13] The text here refers to the three human goals or triple path (*trivarga* or *puruṣārthas*): religion (*dharma*), profit (*artha*), and pleasure (*kāma*).

[15] The sacrifice described here is the *agnihotra* or daily fire sacrifice, which consists of two

offerings, one in the morning and one in the evening. The 'juncture of daybreak' (*samayādhyuṣite*) is variously glossed by the commentators as the time when neither sun nor stars are visible, the time of dawn, or the time when the night disappears.

[16] The ceremony of the infusion of semen is the *garbhādhāna* or 'conception of the embryo'. These ceremonies belong to men of the first three classes; similar ceremonies are performed for women and servants, but without Vedic verses.

[17] The Land of the Veda (Brahmāvarta) is the traditonal holy land of ancient India.

[19] Brahmarṣideśa ('The Country of Priestly Sages') is the area of the Doab ('two waters', that is, the land between the two rivers, Ganges and Yamuna) between Delhi and Mathura.

[21] The Himālayas and the Vindhyas are the two great mountain ranges in Northern and Central India. Prayāga is the modern Allahabad; Vinaśana (the 'Disappearance') is the place where the river Sarasvatī disappears.

[22] This is Āryāvarta, the cultural centre of traditional Hinduism. An Aryan is a twice-born man, a member of one of the three upper classes; the term is sometimes translated as 'noble'.

[23] The barbarians (*mlecchas*) are people who cannot speak Sanskrit and are not Aryans.

[27] This verse refers to six of the twelve life-cycle rituals. The first three, the oblations for the embryo, are the ceremonies called (1) *garbhādhāna* ('conception of the embryo', just referred to in 2.26 as the infusion of the semen), (2) *puṃsavana* ('bringing forth a male child'), and (3) *sīmantonnayana* ('parting the mother's hair', in the fourth, sixth, or eighth month of her first pregnancy). The fourth life-cycle ritual is the birth rite (4: *jātakarman*); the eighth is the ceremonial haircut (8) *(cūdā*), and the ninth the initiation (9) (*upanayana*), in which, for a priest, the belt of rushes is made of *muñja* grass, Saccharum Sara or Munja, a tall grass used in making baskets (*see* 2.42). The fifth and seventh rituals (5: *nāmakarman*, the name-giving, and 7: *annaprāśana*, eating-food) are described in 2.30 and 2.34, and the sixth (6: *niṣkramaṇa*, going out) in 2.34. The last three ceremonies are the final ceremonial haircut (10: *keśānta*, described in 2.65), the homecoming of the Vedic student (11: *samāvartana*, in 2.108), and marriage (12: *vivāha*, 3.20–44 and 9.7– 100.)

[28] The triple learning (*trividyā*) is the knowledge of the three Vedas.

[29] The gold may be powdered, or a gold spoon from which the child eats the honey and butter, or simply gold that the child may touch. The Vedic verses are chanted during the ceremony.

[38] The verse to the sun-god, more precisely to Savitṛ, an aspect of the sun, known as the *sāvitrī* or the *gāyatrī* is ṛg *Veda* 3.62.10. It is taught to every twice-born man on his initiation and is recited daily (see 2.77–82, 11.95, etc.).

[39] An outlaw, literally a 'Man of (Unorthodox) Vow', is a *vrātya*, defined at 10.20.

[40] The Vedic (*brāhmya*) bonds would involve teaching the Veda or sacrificing; bonds of sex (*yauna*, literally 'of the womb') would involve marriage and procreation.

[41] The commentators specify that the priest wears the black antelope, the ruler the gazelle, and so forth, and that the skins are to supply the upper garments, while the hemp, linen, and wool are what the lower garments, such as the loincloth, are to be made of. The observant reader will note that hemp, here assigned to the priest's lower garment, is elsewhere used for the belt of a commoner (2.42) and the sacrificial thread of a ruler (2.44).

[42] The ruler's hemp fibre is *mūrvā* grass (Sanseviera Roxburghiana), used only for bowstrings.

[43] The sacrificial grass is *kúsa*, the 'stone-tipped' grass is *aśmantaka*, and the coarse grass *balbaja* (Eleusine Indica). The commentaries suggest that even though only the lack of rushes is specified, the use of the plural in what follows indicates that this rule applies to the possible lack of all three preferred grasses for all three classes.

[44] For ways of wearing the initiatory thread, see 2.63.

[45] The wood-apple is the *bilva* (Aegle Marmelos); the 'straw-eating' plant is the *pālāśa* (Butea Frondosa); the banyan is the *vaṭa* (Ficus Indica), and the acacia the *khadira* (Acacia Catechu); the palm here is *pīlu* (Careya Arborea or Salvadora Persica) and the fig is *udumbara* (Ficus Glomerata).

[48] He goes around the fire clockwise, literally 'to the right' (*pradakṣiṇam*), which means both keeping one's right side towards the object or person being honoured in this way and proceeding from the east to the south (also designated by the term *dakṣiṇa*), which is on the right, since one names the directions while facing east.

[58] These hollows of the hand are called 'fords' because they are used to collect water, as in the ford of a river. Ka (literally, 'Who?') is another name for the Lord of Creatures.

[60] The commentators suggest that the seat of the soul is the heart or the navel.

[63] The normal way to wear the initiatory thread (*upavītin*) is with the right hand raised, i.e. with the initiatory thread under the right hand, resting on the left shoulder. It is worn 'to the front' (or to the east – since one faces the east – *prācīnāvītin*), that is, in reverse, with the left hand raised (i.e. with the thread under the left hand and resting on the right shoulder), at the ceremony for the dead. And it is worn 'down' (*nivītin*) around the neck to worship the sages.

[68] Where we might say that the initiation symbolizes a rebirth, the text says that it manifests a real birth, since a man is not regarded as born at all until he is initiated.

[76] 'A', 'u', and 'm' combine to form 'Om'. The three exclamations (*vyāhṛtis*) are the names of the first three worlds: earth, atmosphere, and heaven.

[77] This verse is the *sāvitrī*, which begins, *tat savitur vareṇyam*; see 2.38. The verse is composed of three sets of syllables literally called feet, *pādas*.

[84] This verse turns on an untranslatable pun: *akṣara* means both 'syllable' and 'not-perishing'.

[85] The sacrifice according to the rules (*vidhiyajña*), or the regular Vedic sacrifice, would include the new-and-full-moon sacrifices, the daily fire sacrifice and so on.

[86] The domestic sacrifices (*pākayajñas*) are the first four of the great sacrifices (*mahāyajñas*; see 3.70), omitting the sacrifice to ultimate reality.

[87] The commentators suggest that 'befriending (all creatures)' implies a dedication to non-violence and a refusal to sacrifice animals, thus emphasizing the advantages of the merely mental sacrifice.

[96] A commentator suggests that understanding here means understanding the mistakes that result from indulging in sensory objects.

[99] If a whole hide of a goat, for instance, is used for the water-bag, there would be four holes where the four legs were attached; if only one of these breaks open, even if all the others remain sealed (as one commentator points out), the whole thing is emptied.

[100] 'Harnessing (energies)' is, literally, *yoga*.

[105] This may apply to occasions such as pollution after a death, when other rituals are forbidden.

[106] The extended sacrifice is a *sattra*, in this case a *brahmasattra*, and 'Vaṣaṭ!' is an exclamation used to mark the end of a recitation. The meaning of the final phrase seems to be that even when the recitation is brought to a close by some interruption, that interruption itself (one commentator suggests that it might be the sound of a thunderburst) is regarded as a satisfactory 'Amen!'.

[110] This verse and the next two may refer to general conversation and knowledge, but in the present context more probably refer to explaining the Veda.

[124] The word here translated as 'You!' is 'Bhoḥ', originally a vocative from the polite form of the second person pronoun.

[131] The guru's wife may simply be the wife of one's revered teacher, but the term may also denote the wife of any closely related and respected male, particularly one's father.

[140] The ritual texts are the *kalpasūtras* and the secret texts are the Upaniṣads or other esoteric explications of the Veda. The teacher is the *ācārya*.

[141] The instructor is the *upādhyāya*.

[143] The ceremony of preparing the sacred fires is the *agnyādheya*; the domestic sacrifices are the *pākayajñas*, the 'Praise of Fire' is the Soma sacrifice called the *agniṣṭoma*, and the officiating priest is the *ṛtvij*.

[145] This verse expresses a view of the relative importance of parents and teachers that differs from the views expressed in the verses that follow. Manu may be quoting two different traditions, or stating first the 'other' view (the *pūrvapakṣa* in Indian logic) and then his preferred view.

[148] 'Crossing to the far shore of the Veda' (*vedapāraga*) is a metaphor for mastering one entire branch (*śākhā*) of a Veda.

[149] 'Here' may mean in this world or in this text.

[153] Some commentators suggest that 'Little Child' (*śiśu*) or 'Poet' (*kavi*) is the name of the sage, while others take the words as nouns, his attributes. This story is told in the *Pañcaviṃśa Brāhmaṇa* 13.2.24 and in the *Mahābhārata* 9.50. The Brāhmaṇa version goes like this: A little child of the Angirases was a maker of Vedic verses among makers of Vedic verses. He used to address his ancestors as 'Little Sons'. The ancestors said to him, 'You act irreligiously when you call us, who are your fathers, "Little Sons".' He answered, 'I am the one who is the father, since I am the maker of Vedic verses.' They asked the gods about this, and the gods said, 'He really is the father who is a maker of Vedic verses.' So he triumphed over them.

[154] The man who has learnt the Veda with all of its subsidiary texts is called an *anūcāna*.

[155] That is, only servants count their seniority in terms of the time elapsed since their birth.

[160] 'The end of the Veda' (*vedānta*) here may designate the 'far shore', i.e. the completion, of Vedic study or the texts at the end of the Veda, i.e. the Upaniṣads.

[172] The refreshment for the dead is the *svadhā*.

[176] The refreshing libation is the *tarpaṇa*.

[181] This verse is *Taittirīya Āraṇyaka* 1.30.

[185] The commentators gloss 'indicted' (*abhiśasta*) as fallen from caste or having committed a major crime.

[187] See 11.119.

[189] Some commentators suggest that 'like a sage' means 'like a hermit', limiting him to small amounts of food that grows wild.

[190] 'This ritual activity' (*karman*) may refer to the general rule in 2.188 or to the exception in 2.189.

[193] The hand that is bared is the right hand, more precisely the right arm, which is kept outside the upper garment.

[199] The commentators say that he should not mention his guru's name without adding a term of respect.

[201] The commentaries distinguish speaking ill (*parivāda*) from reproach (*ninda*) by saying that the former accuses someone of an existent fault, and the latter of a non-existent one; but the use of *ninda* throughout this text to designate correct blame, directed by good people against wrong-doers, seems to indicate the opposite. Some suggest that this verse, like the previous one, refers merely to the crime of listening to slander or reproach, not actually perpetrating it. The animal transformations may be supposed, as usual, to take place in the next rebirth. 'Living off his teacher' seems to mean eating the best food before giving it to the teacher.

[205] This verse turns on the double meaning of *guru*, which designates both teachers and

venerable people, including parents.

[206] 'Those who are born of the same womb' (*svayoniṣu*) are identified by the commentators as various older males in the family.

[216] The rules are given at 2.129–31.

[219] Some commentators, perhaps looking ahead to the next verse, say that this means that he should not sleep in a village; others, that he should be carrying out his duties outside the village at the two twilights.

[220] The words 'for pleasure' and 'unknowingly' (*kāmacāratas* and *avijñānāt*) have several different possible meanings in this verse. In a general way, they designate the two possible conditions for any error: intentional and unintentional, or knowing and unknowing, which can refer to sleeping (whether he accidentally falls asleep or willingly takes to his bed) and/or to the course of the sun (whether or not he knows that the sun is rising and/or setting while he is in bed). In this particular case, the terms seem primarily to mean that he stays in bed 'for pleasure' not (as one commenttor points out) because he is sick, but because he wants to (or even, perhaps, for the sake of lust).

[223] The commentators strain to make sense of this extraordinary, and apparently heretical, verse in various ways. Some suggest that the woman is the wife of the teacher and that the 'lower born' (*avaraja*) is simply someone younger than the student, while others specify that nothing contrary to the teachings should ever be done, even in this instance. 'He' almost certainly means the student of the Veda, who is apparently here allowed to imitate certain of the actions of those who are not twice-born, if those actions are 'better' (*śreyas* – better than those prescribed for him?) or even if he simply wants to.

[224] The verse argues, contrary to those who would privilege one or two of the three elements of the triple path (*trivarga*), that the best thing (*śreyas*) is the triad as a whole.

[227] The word for 'redemption' (*niṣkṛti*) is the same for the repayment of a debt and the expiatory payment for an error.

[228] The trouble that one takes to please these three is equated with the pain that one undergoes in generating inner heat; more particularly, it is suggested that the reward for serving them is equal to the reward for generating inner heat.

[229] He should not, without their permission, undertake the duties (*dharma*) of actually generating heat or going on pilgrimage, for example, which would interfere with his service to them.

[231] The three basic fires of a man with three fires (*āhitāgni*) are the householder's fire (the *gārhapatya*), into which the regular daily sacrifices are offered (this is the only fire of a man who has only one sacred fire, an *ekāgni*); the southern fire (*dakṣiṇa*), into which offerings to the ancestors are usually made; and the *āhavanīya*, into which oblations to the gods are usually made.

[236] One commentator points out that he need not tell them of anything that he may be contemplating if it will inconvenience them, since (as 2.229 has pointed out) they will not give him permission to do it.

[238] The final phrase may also mean 'jewels and women', as in verse 2.240.

[242] 'Endlessly' (*atyantikam*) means, according to the commentaries, that he takes a vow to remain a chaste student of the Vedas for his whole life (a *naiṣṭhika*) and spends it with his guru.

[247] The 'co-feeding relative' is a *sapiṇḍa*, literally 'one who shares the same balls', a person related in such a way as to make funeral offerings of balls of rice (*piṇḍas*) to the same male ancestors. See 5.59–79.

[249] The supreme condition (*paraṃ sthānam*) is probably yet another term for the world of ultimate reality.

CHAPTER 3

[*1*] The vow for studying the three Vedas with a guru is for thirty-six years, or half of that, or a quarter of that, or whenever the undertaking comes to an end. [*2*] When, unswerving in his chastity, he has learned the Vedas, or two Vedas, or even one Veda, in the proper order, he should enter the householder stage of life. [*3*] When he is recognized as one who has, by fulfilling his own duties, received the legacy of the Veda from his father, he should first be seated on a couch, adorned with garlands, and honoured with (an offering made from the milk of) a cow.

[*4*] When he has received his guru's permission and bathed and performed the ritual for homecoming according to the rules, a twice-born man should marry a wife who is of the same class and has the right marks. [*5*] A woman who is neither a co-feeding relative on her mother's side nor belongs to the same lineage (of the sages) on her father's side, and who is a virgin, is recommended for marriage to twice-born men. [*6*] When a man connects himself with a woman, he should avoid the ten following families, even if they are great, or rich in cows, goats, sheep, property, or grain: [*7*] a family that has abandoned the rites, or does not have male children, or does not chant the Veda; and those families in which they have hairy bodies, piles, consumption, weak digestion, epilepsy, white leprosy, or black leprosy.

[*8*] A man should not marry a girl who is a redhead or has an extra limb or is sickly or has no body hair or too much body hair or talks too much or is sallow; [*9*] or who is named after a constellation, a tree, or a river, or who has a low-caste name, or is named after a mountain, a bird, a snake, or has a menial or frightening name. [*10*] He should marry a woman who does not lack any part of her body and who has a pleasant name, who walks like a goose or an elephant, whose body hair and hair on the head is fine, whose teeth are not big, and who has delicate limbs. [*11*] A wise man will not marry a woman who has no brother or whose father is unknown, for fear that she may be an appointed daughter or that he may act wrongly.

[*12*] A woman of the same class is recommended to twice-born men for the first marriage; but for men who are driven by desire, these are the women, in progressively descending order: [*13*] According to tradition, only a servant woman can be the wife of a servant; she and one of his own class can be the wife of a commoner; these two and one of his own class for a king; and these three and one of his own class for a priest. [*14*] Not a single story mentions a servant woman as the wife of a priest or a ruler, even in extremity. [*15*] Twice-born men

who are so infatuated as to marry women of low caste quickly reduce their families, including the descendants, to the status of servants. [16] A man falls when he weds a servant woman, according to Atri and to (Gautama) the son of Utathya, or when he has a son by her, according to Śaunaka, or when he has any children by her, according to Bhṛgu. [17] A priest who climbs into bed with a servant woman goes to hell; if he begets a son in her, he loses the the status of priest. [18] The ancestors and the gods do not eat the offerings to the gods, to the ancestors, and to guests that such a man makes with her, and so he does not go to heaven. [19] No redemption is prescribed for a man who drinks the saliva from the lips of a servant woman or is tainted by her breath or begets a son in her.

[20] Now learn, in summary, these eight ways of marrying women, that are for all four classes, for better and for worse, here on earth and after death: [21] the marriages named after Brahmā, the gods, the sages, the Lord of Creatures, the demons, the centaurs, the ogres, and, eighth and lowest, the ghouls. [22] I will explain to you all about which one is right for each class, and the virtues and vices of each, and their advantages and disadvantages for progeneration. [23] It should be understood that the first six, as they are listed in order, are right for a priest, the last four for a ruler, and these same four, with the exception of the ogre marriage, for a commoner or a servant. [24] The poets say that the first four are recommended for a priest, only one, the ogre marriage, for a ruler, and the demon marriage for a commoner and a servant. [25] But here, three of the (last) five are right, while two – those of the ghouls and the demons – are traditionally regarded as wrong and are never to be performed. [26] Two of the marriages mentioned above, those according to the centaurs and the ogres, are traditionally regarded as right for rulers, whether they are used separately or combined.

[27] It is said to be the law of Brahmā when a man dresses his daughter and adorns her and he himself gives her as a gift to a man he has summoned, one who knows the revealed canon and is of good character. [28] They call it the law of the gods when a man adorns his daughter and, in the course of a sacrifice, gives her as a gift to the officiating priest who is properly performing the ritual. [29] It is called the sages' law when he gives away his daughter by the rules, after receiving from the bridegroom a cow and a bull, or two cows and bulls, in accordance with the law. [30] The tradition calls it the rule of the Lord of Creatures when a man gives away his daughter after adorning her and saying 'May the two of you together fulfil your duties.'

[31] It is called the demonic law when a man takes the girl because he wants her himself, when he has given as much wealth as he can to

her relatives and to the girl herself. [*32*] It is to be recognized as a centaur marriage when the girl and her lover join with one another in sexual union because they want to, out of desire. [*33*] It is called the rule of the ogres when a man forcibly carries off a girl out of her house, screaming and weeping, after he has killed, wounded, and broken. [*34*] The lowest and most evil of marriages, known as that of the ghouls, takes place when a man secretly has sex with a girl who is asleep, drunk, or out of her mind. [*35*] For priests, the gift of a girl with (a libation of) water is the best (marriage); but for the other classes (the best is) when they desire one another.

[*36*] Listen, priests, while I tell you fully about all the qualities of these marriages that Manu has proclaimed. [*37*] If a son born to a woman who has had a Brahmā marriage does good deeds, he frees from guilt ten of the ancestors who came before him, ten later descendants, and himself as the twenty-first. [*38*] A son born to a woman who had a marriage of the gods (frees) seven ancestors and seven descendants, a son born to a woman who had a marriage of the sages (frees) three (of each), and a son born to a woman who had a marriage of the Lord of Creatures (frees) six (of each). [*39*] The sons born from these four marriages, in order beginning with the Brahmā marriage, are filled with the splendour of the Veda and are esteemed by educated men. [*40*] Beautiful and endowed with the quality of lucidity, rich and famous, enjoying life to the fullest, most religious, they live for a hundred years. [*41*] But from those (four) other remaining bad marriages are born cruel sons, liars who hate the Veda and religion. [*42*] Out of blameless marriages with women come blameless progeny. Blameworthy progeny come to men from blameworthy (marriages); therefore one should avoid the blameworthy ones.

[*43*] The transformative ritual of taking the bride by the hand is prescribed for women of the same class; know that this (following) procedure is for the marriage ritual with women of a different class. [*44*] When a woman marries a man of superior class, a woman of the ruler class must take hold of an arrow, a commoner girl a whip, and a servant woman must grasp the fringe of (his) garment.

[*45*] A man should have sex with his wife during her fertile season, and always find his satisfaction in his own wife; when he desires sexual pleasure he should go to her to whom he is vowed, except on the days at the (lunar) junctures. [*46*] The natural fertile season of women is traditionally said to last for sixteen nights, though these include four special days that good people despise. [*47*] Among these (nights), the first four, the eleventh, and the thirteenth are disapproved; the other ten nights are approved. [*48*] On the even nights, sons are conceived, and on the uneven nights, daughters;

therefore a man who wants sons should unite with his wife during her fertile season on the even nights. [*49*] A male child is born when the semen of the man is greater (than that of the woman), and a female child when (the semen) of the woman is greater (than that of the man); if both are equal, a hermaphrodite is born, or a boy and a girl; and if (the semen) is weak or scanty, the opposite will occur. [*50*] A man who avoids women on the (six) disapproved nights and on eight other nights is regarded as chaste, no matter which of the four stages of life he is in.

[*51*] No learned father should take a bride-price for his daughter, no matter how small, for a man who, out of greed, exacts a bride-price would be selling his child like a pimp. [*52*] And those deluded relatives who live off a woman's property – her carriages, her clothes, and so on – are evil and go to hell. [*53*] Some say that the cow and bull (given) during the (wedding) of the sages is a bride-price, but it is not so. No matter how great or small (the price), the sale amounts to prostitution. [*54*] Girls whose relatives do not take the bride-price for themselves are not prostituted; that (gift) is merely honorific and a mercy to maidens.

[*55*] Fathers, brothers, husbands, and brothers-in-law who wish for great good fortune should revere these women and adorn them. [*56*] The deities delight in places where women are revered, but where women are not revered all rites are fruitless. [*57*] Where the women of the family are miserable, the family is soon destroyed, but it always thrives where the women are not miserable. [*58*] Homes that are cursed by women of the family who have not been treated with due reverence are completely destroyed, as if struck down by witchcraft. [*59*] Therefore men who wish to prosper should always revere these women with ornaments, clothes, and food at celebrations and festivals.

[*60*] There is unwavering good fortune in a family where the husband is always satisfied by the wife, and the wife by the husband. [*61*] If the wife is not radiant she does not stimulate the man; and because the man is unstimulated the making of children does not happen. [*62*] If the woman is radiant, the whole family is radiant, but if she is not radiant the whole family is not radiant. [*63*] Through bad marriages, the neglect of rites, failure to study the Veda, and transgressing against priests, families cease to be families.

[*64*] By (making a living from) crafts or business or from cows, horses, and carts, by begetting children only with servant women, by farming the land, by serving a king, [*65*] by sacrificing for those who are unfit for the sacrifice, and by denying the doctrine of the effects of past actions, families who are bereft of Vedic verses quickly perish. [*66*] But families rich in Vedic verses join the highest rank of families

and cultivate great fame even if they have little property.

[*67*] In the fire set at the time of marriage, the householder should perform the domestic rituals and the five (great) sacrifices in accordance with the rules, and do his everyday cooking. [*68*] A householder has five slaughter-houses, whose use fetters him: the fireplace, the grindstone, the broom, the mortar and pestle, and the water jar. [*69*] The great sages devised the five great sacrifices for the householder to do every day to redeem him from all of these (slaughter-houses) successively. [*70*] The study (of the Veda) is the sacrifice to ultimate reality, and the refreshing libation is the sacrifice to the ancestors; the offering into the fire is for the gods, the propitiatory offering of portions of food is for the disembodied spirits, and the revering of guests is the sacrifice to men. [*71*] The man who does not neglect these five great sacrifices as long as he is able to perform them is not defiled by the stains of the slaughter-houses, even while he lives as a householder. [*72*] But whoever scatters no propitiatory offering to the five – the gods, guests, dependants, ancestors, and the self – breathes but does not (truly) live. [*73*] These five sacrifices are [also] known as 'the not-offered-in-the-fire', 'the offered-in-the-fire', 'the offered-by-scattering', 'the offered-to-priests', and 'the eaten'. [*74*] 'The not-offered-in-the-fire' is chanting (the Veda), 'the offered-in-the-fire' is the offering into the fire, 'the offered-by-scattering' is the propitiatory offering to the disembodied spirits, 'the offered-to-priests' is the reception of priests (as guests), and 'the eaten' is the refreshing libation to the ancestors.

[*75*] The man in this (stage of life) should be regularly engaged in the daily personal study (of the Veda), and also in rituals for the gods; for the man who is diligently engaged in rituals for the gods maintains this (whole universe), moving and unmoving. [*76*] An offering cast properly into the fire approaches the sun; rain is created from the sun, from rain comes food, and from that, progeny. [*77*] Just as all living creatures depend on air in order to live, so do members of the other stages of life subsist by depending on householders. [*78*] Since people in the other three stages of life are supported every day by the knowledge and the food of the householder, therefore the householder stage of life is the best. [*79*] It must be carried out with zeal by the man who wants to win an incorruptible heaven (after death) and endless happiness here on earth, but it cannot be carried out by men with feeble sensory powers.

[*80*] The sages, ancestors, gods, disembodied spirits, and guests expect things from householders, which the understanding man should do for them. [*81*] He should honour the sages with the private recitation of the Veda, the gods with offerings into the fire in accordance with the rules, the ancestors with the ceremonies for the

dead, men with food, and the disembodied spirits with the ritual of the propitiatory offering. [*82*] Day after day at the ceremony for the dead he should offer what gives pleasure to the ancestors: food, or water, or milk, roots, or fruits. [*83*] He should feed a priest, even if it is only one, as a means of pleasing the ancestors during the ritual that is part of the five great sacrifices; but he should not feed any twice-born (priest) at this time for the purposes of fulfilling the ritual to the All-gods.

[*84*] Every day, a priest should take (a portion) of the sanctified (food) for the ritual to the All-gods prepared according to the rules and make an offering in the household fire to the following deities: [*85*] first to Fire, then to Soma, and then to both of them together, and then to the All-gods and Dhanvantari; [*86*] and then to the goddesses of the new-moon day and the full-moon day, to the Lord of Creatures, to the earth and sky together, and finally to Fire of the Perfected Offering.

[*87*] And when he has offered the oblations properly in this manner, he should distribute the propitiatory offering in all the cardinal directions, in clockwise order: one each to Indra, Death, the lord of the Waters, and the Moon, together with their attendants. [*88*] He should put down (a portion) at the door while saying 'To the Maruts,' and one in some water while saying 'To the waters.' Saying 'To the Lord of the Trees,' he should offer (one) on the mortar and pestle. [*89*] He should make a propitiatory offering at the head to the goddess of Good Fortune, and at the foot to the Benevolent Dark Goddess, and in the centre of the house to ultimate reality and the Lord of the House. [*90*] He should toss up into the air a propitiatory offering to the All-gods, and one to the disembodied spirits who roam in the daytime and also one to the disembodied spirits who roam at night. [*91*] In the upper part of the house he should make a propitiatory offering for the Spirit of All Food, and all the remainder of the propitiatory offering should be put towards the south for the ancestors. [*92*] And he should placidly scatter a propitiatory offering on the ground for the dogs, for those who have fallen, for 'Dog-cookers', for those whose evil deeds have made them ill, for birds, and for worms. [*93*] A priest who in this way constantly honours all the disembodied spirits takes on a physical form of brilliant energy and attains the supreme condition by the straightest route.

[*94*] When he has performed this ritual of the propitiatory offering, he should first feed a guest and, in accordance with the rules, give alms to a beggar and to a chaste student of the Veda. [*95*] By giving alms, the twice-born householder wins a reward for merit which is the same as the reward for merit won by giving a cow to the guru in accordance with the rule. [*96*] He should present alms, or even just a

vessel of water that has first been ritually prepared, to a priest who knows the true meaning of the Veda. [*97*] The offerings that ignorant men make to the gods and ancestors are lost if the donors give them by mistake to priests who have become dead ashes. [*98*] An offering offered in the fire which is the mouth of a priest rich in learning and inner heat rescues (the sacrificer) from an unfortunate fate and a great offence.

[*99*] He should offer a guest, as soon as he arrives, a seat, some water, and food that has first been ritually prepared and perfectly cooked, to the best of his ability. [*100*] If a priest stays (as a guest) and is not honoured, (when he departs) he takes away all the (credit for) good deeds even of someone who lives by gleaning (corn) and gathering (single grains), even of someone who makes regular offerings in five fires. [*101*] Grass (laid down for a resting place), space (to rest), water, and pleasant conversation – these four things never run out in the house of good people. [*102*] A priest who stays even one night is traditionally regarded as a guest, for he stays (*sthita*) not all the time (*anitya*); thus he is called 'a guest' (*atithi*, 'not staying'). [*103*] A convivial priest who lives in the same village should not be regarded as a guest, even when he comes to a house where there are a wife and (sacrificial) fires. [*104*] Stupid householders who live off other people's cooked food become because of that, after death, the livestock of those who have given them food.

[*105*] A guest who comes with the setting sun in the evening should not be turned away by the householder who is a sacrificer; whether he arrives at a convenient time or an inconvenient time, he should not be allowed to stay in his house without eating. [*106*] (The householder) should not himself eat anything that he does not feed to his guest. The revering of guests wins wealth, a good reputation, long life, and heaven. [*107*] He should present the best seat and room, the best bed, the best farewell and the best service to guests of the highest status, inferior ones to those of inferior status, and middling ones to those whose status is the same as his. [*108*] And if another guest should come after the ritual to the All-gods is finished, he should give him, too, whatever food he can, but he should not distribute the propitiatory offering (again).

[*109*] A priest should not drop the name of his family and his lineage (of the sages) in order to get a meal, for wise men call a man who invokes them in this way to get a meal 'an eater of regurgitated food'. [*110*] A ruler is not called a guest in the house of a priest, nor is a commoner, a servant, a friend, a relative, or one's guru. [*111*] But if a ruler comes to the house as a guest, (the householder) may feed him, too, if he wants to, after the priests have been fed. [*112*] If even commoners and servants have arrived at the house as guests, in a

show of his mercy he may feed them along with his dependants. [*113*] Others, too, such as friends who have come to the house in the spirit of good will, he may feed with natural food along with his wife, to the best of his ability. [*114*] He may without hesitation feed newlywed women, small girls, people who are ill, and pregnant women, right after the guests. [*115*] The fool who eats first, without giving anything to these people, does not know that because he is eating he himself is devoured by dogs and vultures.

[*116*] Now, when the priests, the members of the family, and the dependants have eaten, the husband and wife may later eat what is left over. [*117*] The householder should eat the leftovers only after he has revered the gods, the sages, humans, ancestors, and the household deities. [*118*] The person who cooks only for himself eats nothing but error, for the food left over from the sacrifice is the food intended for good men.

[*119*] With the honey-mixture he should honour a king, an officiating priest, a Vedic graduate, a guru, close friend, father-in-law, or maternal uncle who has come again after a year (since the last visit). [*120*] He should also honour with the honey-mixture a king or a priest who knows the Veda by heart if they arrive when a sacrifice is being performed, but not if there is no sacrifice – that is the fixed rule.

[*121*] In the evening, the wife may make the propitiatory offerings from the sanctified food, although without reciting any of the Vedic verses, for what is called the ritual of the All-gods is prescribed for both the morning and the evening.

[*122*] Every month on the new-moon day, when he has finished with the sacrifice to the ancestors, a priest who maintains the fire should perform the ceremony to the dead called 'the offering after the balls'. [*123*] Wise men know the monthly ritual to the ancestors as the ceremony to the dead 'offered after' (the balls), which should be diligently performed with the recommended flesh. [*124*] I will explain to you, leaving nothing out, which ones and how many among the priests are to be fed with what kinds of food, and which ones are to be excluded.

[*125*] Two priests should be fed at the ritual for the gods and three at the ritual for the ancestors, or one at each of the two rituals. Even a very rich man does not need a crowd to proceed. [*126*] A crowd is detrimental to five things: offering proper hospitality, doing so at the right time and place, purification, and concord among the priests. Therefore there should not be a crowd here. [*127*] This rite for the dead spirits on the new-moon day, called the ritual for the ancestors, is famous. The ritual for the dead spirits, performed by ordinary people, always benefits the man who is engaged in its performance.

[*128*] Offerings to the gods and ancestors are to be handed over by donors only to a priest who knows the Veda by heart. A gift to such a most worthy priest bears great fruit. [*129*] He should feed at least one learned man at the ritual for the gods, and at least one at the ritual to the ancestors – rather than many who are ignorant of the Vedic verses. Then he reaps abundant fruit.

[*130*] He should carefully scrutinize even the distant (lineage of a) priest who has crossed to the far shore of the Veda; being a fording place for the giving of offerings to the gods and ancestors, he is traditionally known as a proper guest. [*131*] For while thousands upon thousands of men who do not know the ṛg *Veda* might eat there, if one man who knows the Vedic verses is pleased he is worth all of them in religious merit. [*132*] Offerings to the ancestors and gods should be given to a man elevated by knowledge; hands smeared with blood cannot be purified with more blood. [*133*] As many mouthfuls as are swallowed, at offerings to the gods and ancestors, by a man who does not know the Vedic verses, that is how many white-hot spikes, spears, and iron balls the dead spirit swallows.

[*134*] Some priests are grounded in knowledge, others in inner heat; some are grounded in both inner heat and the private recitation of the Veda, others in ritual acts. [*135*] Offerings to the ancestors are to be diligently dispatched to those grounded in knowledge, but offerings to the gods rightly (may be given) to any of the four (above). [*136*] Should there be a son who has crossed to the far shore of the Veda while his father does not know the Veda by heart or a father who has crossed to the far shore of the Veda while his son does not know the Veda by heart, [*137*] it should be understood that of them the one with the father who knows the Veda by heart is superior, but the other one deserves respect too because of the reverence due to the verses of the Veda.

[*138*] One should not feed a friend at a ceremony for the dead; his favour is to be won through riches. At a ceremony for the dead one should feed a twice-born man who is considered neither an enemy nor a friend. [*139*] There is no reward for the ceremonies to the dead and the oblations offered, after his death, on behalf of someone whose chief aim in performing ceremonies for the dead and oblations (to the gods) is the winning of friends. [*140*] The man who is so deluded that he uses the ceremony for the dead as an excuse to socialize, this lowest of the twice-born, this performer of ceremonies for the dead for friends, tumbles from the world of heaven. [*141*] Such a communal meal is said to be a sacrificial gift from twice-born men to the ghouls. It remains stuck here in this world like a blind cow in one stable. [*142*] Just as a sower who sows seed in barren soil reaps no harvest, so the donor who gives the offering to someone ignorant of the ṛg

Veda obtains no fruit. [*143*] A sacrificial gift presented to a learned man in accordance with the rules gives both donor and recipient shares in the fruit, here on earth and after death. [*144*] At a ceremony for the dead it is better to honour a friend rather than an enemy, however well qualified, for an oblation eaten by an enemy bears no fruit after death.

[*145*] At a ceremony for the dead, one should try to feed a man who has crossed to the far shore of the *ṛg Veda*, or a scholar of the *Yajur Veda* who has gone to the end of his recension, or one who has concluded his study of the *Sāma Veda*. [*146*] If any one of these is fed and honoured at a ceremony for the dead, (the host's) ancestors going back seven generations will be perpetually satisfied. [*147*] This is indeed the primary ruling when it comes to the presentation of offerings to the gods and ancestors. But the following should be known as the secondary ruling which is always practised by good men: [*148*] A man may feed (on these occasions, under this secondary provision) his grandfather or uncles on the mother's side; his sister's son; his father-in-law; his guru; his daughter's son; his daughter's husband; any relative on his mother's side; his officiating priest; or a patron for whom he offers sacrifices. [*149*] A man who knows the law need not scrutinize the priest (invited) to the rituals for the gods. When it comes to rituals for the ancestors, however, he should diligently scrutinize (the guests).

[*150*] Manu has said that priests who are thieves, fallen men, impotent men, or atheists are unworthy of the offerings to the gods and ancestors. [*151*] At a ceremony for the dead one should not feed (a student or ascetic) with matted hair, anyone who has not studied (the Veda), a weakling, a gambler, or those who sacrifice for just anyone. [*152*] Doctors, priests who attend on idols, people who sell meat, and people who support themselves by trade are to be excluded from offerings to the gods and ancestors; [*153*] so, too, a person who contradicts his guru or who has abandoned his (sacrificial) fire, a usurer, a menial servant of the village or of the king, and anyone who has mangled fingernails or discoloured teeth; [*154*] a consumptive, a herdsman, a man who usurps his elder brother's place or who allows his younger brother to usurp his place, anyone who neglects ritual formalities or hates priests and the Veda, or who is a central member of an association; [*155*] a travelling bard, a man who has shed his semen in violation of a vow, the husband of a servant woman, the son of a remarried woman, a one-eyed man, or a man whose wife's lover lives in his house; [*156*] a man who teaches the Veda for pay or who pays to learn it, a man who has a servant as a pupil or a servant as a guru, or whose speech is coarse, the son of an adulterous woman or of a widow; [*157*] a man who abandons his mother, father, or guru for

no reason, or who has joined, through Vedic or sexual bonds, with those who have fallen.

[*158*] An arsonist or poisoner, a man who eats the food of the son of an adulterous woman, a man who sells Soma, a seafarer, a panegyrist, an oil-vendor, a false witness; [*159*] anyone who argues with his father, a gambler, a drunk, a man whose evil deeds have made him ill, a man indicted, a deceiver, a seller of spices, [*160*] a man who makes bows and arrows, a man who marries his older brother's widow, an ingrate who does harm to a friend, a man who lives by shooting dice, and a man whose son is his teacher; [*161*] an epileptic, a man with swollen glands, a leper, a slanderer, a madman, a blind man, and a man who reviles the Veda: they should all be excluded.

[*162*] A trainer of elephants, oxen, horses, or camels, an astrologer, a breeder of birds, and an instructor in the martial arts; [*163*] anyone who diverts streams, or who amuses himself by damming them up, a housebuilder, a messenger, and a (professional) tree-planter, [*164*] a man who keeps sporting dogs, a falconer, a corrupter of virgins, a violent man, a man who makes a living off servants, and one who sacrifices to groups of goblins; [*165*] a man who has turned away from (proper) conduct, an impotent man, someone who is always asking for something, a farmer, a club-footed man, and one whom good people revile; [*166*] a man who keeps sheep or buffaloes, the husband of a woman who was married before, and a man who carries out dead bodies – all these are to be strenuously excluded.

[*167*] A learned and eminent twice-born man should exclude from both (rituals, for the gods and for the ancestors) these lowest of the twice-born, whose conduct is contemptible and who do not belong in the rows. [*168*] Truly, an uneducated priest has been extinguished like a grass fire; no one should give him offerings to the gods, since one should not make an offering into dead ashes.

[*169*] I will explain to you, leaving nothing out, what fruits subsequently arise for the man who gives gifts to a man who does not belong in the rows at rituals for the gods or ancestors: [*170*] the ogres devour what is eaten by twice-born men who break their vows, by younger brothers who usurp the place of the elder brother and others like them, and by others who do not belong in the rows. [*171*] A man is known as a younger brother who usurps the place of the elder brother if he marries or lights the fires and begins performing the daily fire sacrifices before the elder brother has done so; the elder brother in these cases is called an elder brother whose place is usurped by the younger brother. [*172*] The elder brother whose place is usurped by the younger, the younger brother who usurps the place of the elder, and she who is involved (in such twisted-up marriages),

all go to hell, together with the one who gives away (his daughter in such a marriage), and, fifth, the priest who performs the ceremony. [*173*] A man is known as a man who marries his older brother's widow if, out of lust, he conceives a passion for the wife of his deceased brother – even if she has been appointed (to have a child by him) in accordance with law. [*174*] Two kinds of sons are born in other men's wives, the son of an adulterous woman and the son of a widow: the former is (born) while the husband still lives, and the latter after the husband has died. [*175*] But creatures with the breath of life who are born in another man's field cause the offerings to the gods and ancestors to be lost to those who give them, both here on earth and after death.

[*176*] When a person who does not belong in the ranks looks at those who do belong there while they are eating, the naive donor obtains no reward for all those who have been looked at. [*177*] If one blind man is visible, the donor's reward for feeding ninety who belong there is lost; (the sight of) a one-eyed man loses (the reward for) sixty, a leper for a hundred, and a man whose evil deeds have made him ill, for a thousand. [*178*] When (a guest) who sacrifices for servants touches priests with any part of his body, the donor at the ceremony for the dead gets no reward for the gifts presented to all those who have been touched. [*179*] If a priest, even one who knows the Veda, greedily accepts the gift of that (unqualified) man, he goes speedily to his doom, as a pot of unbaked clay dissolves in water. [*180*] (Food) given to a Soma-seller becomes excrement; (that given) to a doctor becomes pus and blood; (given) to the priest who attends on idols, it disappears altogether; and (given) to a usurer it has no standing. [*181*] What is given to a man who makes his living by trade becomes nothing in this world or the other; what is given to a priest born of a woman who was married before is like an object offered as an oblation in dead ashes. [*182*] But wise men say that food given to those other bad people who do not belong in the rows, just described, becomes fat, blood, flesh, marrow, and bone.

[183] Now learn fully how the rows that are damaged by the presence of those who do not belong in the rows are purified by the inclusion of (certain) priests, and which of these priests are those who purify the rows.

[*184*] Those who are pre-eminent in all the Vedas and the explanatory texts, and also those born into a line of priests who know their Veda by heart, are known as purifiers of the ranks. [*185*] A man who has studied the story of Naciketas, or who keeps five sacrificial fires, or has studied the 'three-bird' passage, or knows all six of the supplementary texts to the Veda, or is born out of a Brahmā marriage, or can chant the 'most excellent' chant,[*186*] or who knows the

meaning of the Veda, or can preach from the Veda, a chaste student of the Veda, one who has given away a thousand (cows at a sacrifice), and one who has reached the ripe age of one hundred are to be known as priests who purify the rows.

[*187*] Either on the day before or on the very day on which a ceremony for the dead is held, at least three priests such as are mentioned above should be duly invited. [*188*] A twice-born man who has been invited to a ritual for the ancestors, and the one who sponsors it, should always exercise self-restraint and not recite the Vedic chants (during this time). [*189*] For the ancestors hover about those twice-born men who have been invited; they follow after them like the wind, and sit down next to them when they sit down. [*190*] And if a priest is properly summoned to the offerings to the gods or the ancestors but somehow lets it pass by, he is evil and becomes a pig (after his death).

[*191*] A man who has been invited to a ceremony for the dead and pleasures himself with a servant woman pays for all the bad deeds of the donor of that ritual, whatever they are. [*192*] The ancestors are the deities of ancient times, free from anger, intent upon purification, always chaste; they have laid down all weapons and are counted among the great.

[*193*] Now learn everything about the birth of all these (ancestors), and which restraints should be observed in attending upon them.

[*194*] The various groups of ancestors are traditionally said to be sons of all those sages, beginning with Marīci, who are themselves the offspring of Manu, the child of the God of the Golden Womb. [*195*] The 'Soma-seated', the offspring of Virāj, are traditionally known as the ancestors of the Amenables. The world-famous ones called 'Tasted-by-Fire', the sons of Marīci, are (the ancestors) of the gods. [*196*] The 'Seated-on-Sacrificial-Grass', children of Atri, are traditionally known to be the ancestors of the demons, titans, genies, centaurs, snakes, ogres, supernatural birds, and quasi-men. [*197*] Those called the 'Soma-drinkers' are (the ancestors) of the priests, the 'Oblation-eaters' (are the ancestors) of the rulers, those called 'Drinkers-of-Melted-Butter' of the commoners, and 'Those-who-have-a-Good-Time' of the servants. [*198*] Furthermore, the 'Soma-drinkers' are the sons of Kavi, the 'Oblation-eaters' are the issue of Angiras, the 'Drinkers-of-Melted-Butter' come from Pulastya, and 'Those-who-have-a-Good-Time' are the sons of Vasiṣṭha. [*199*] The 'Fire-burnt', the 'Non-fire-burnt', the sons of Kavi, the 'Seated-on-Sacrificial-Grass', the 'Tasted-by-Fire', and 'Those-Connected-with-Soma' should be assigned (as ancestors) only to the priests. [200] Know also that those primary groups of ancestors listed above also have endless sons and grandsons here on earth.

[*201*] From the sages the ancestors are born, and from the ancestors come gods and humans. But from the gods comes the entire universe of living things, both moving and still, in order. [*202*] Just a little water, given to (the ancestors), with faith, in silver cups or cups inlaid with silver, procures an incorruptible reward. [203] It is more important for the twice-born to perform rituals to the ancestors than to perform rituals to the gods, for the ritual for the gods that precedes the ritual to the ancestors is traditionally regarded as making it grow strong. [*204*] In these (rituals to the ancestors), the ritual for the gods should be performed first, as a protection, for the ogres snatch away the ceremony for the dead that has been left unprotected. [*205*] One should take care to begin and end (the ceremony for the dead) with a ritual for the gods, and not one for the ancestors, for a man who attempts to make it begin and end with a ritual for the ancestors is quickly ruined together with all his descendants.

[*206*] He should' smear cowdung on an unpolluted and secluded place, making sure to form it so that it slopes towards the south. [*207*] For the ancestors are always pleased with a gift made in clean, open spaces, on the banks of rivers and other secluded places. [*208*] When the priests have washed themselves thoroughly with water, he should have them sit on seats that have been individually prepared by spreading sacrificial grass on them. [*209*] When he has had those irreproachable priests take their seats, he should honour them with sweet-smelling garlands and perfumes, beginning with those who are there for the ritual for the gods. [*210*] When they have been given water, sesame seeds, and sacrificial grass used for a purifier, a priest, authorized by all the other priests together, should make offerings into the fire.

[*211*] He should begin by making the nourishing (ritual) to Fire, Soma, and Yama, offering the oblation in accordance with the rules. After that, he should satisfy the ancestors. [*212*] But if there is no (sacrificial) fire there, then he may simply make the offering into the hand of a priest, for priests who have insight into the Vedic verses declare that, 'A twice-born man is the same as fire.' [*213*] The ancients also say that those priests who are free from anger, easy to propitiate, and dedicated to making people grow strong, are the gods at the ceremony for the dead.

[*214*] When the whole series of rituals into the fire is finished, ending towards the south (or the right side), he should sprinkle some water on the ground with his right hand. [*215*] Making three balls out of the remains of the oblation, he should concentrate and, facing south, scatter them just as the water was sprinkled. [*216*] And then, when he has scattered those balls carefully after their ritual preparation, he should wipe that hand on those blades of sacrifical

grass; this is for those ancestors who have the wipings as their portion. [*217*] He should then rinse his mouth, turn around (towards the north), slowly suppress his breath three times, and offer salutations with Vedic verses to the six seasons and to the ancestors. [*218*] He should then slowly pour out the remainder of the water again close to the balls. Then, with a concentrated mind he should sniff those balls in the order in which they were scattered. [*219*] Taking up a minute particle from each of the balls, in the proper order, he should feed this to those seated priests in accordance with the rules, before (feeding them anything else).

[*220*] If his father is still living he should scatter the balls only for those ancestors who precede him. Alternatively, he may invite his own father as one of the priests who come to the ceremony for the dead and feed him there. [*221*] If his father is dead but his grandfather is still living, he just offers salutations to his father and great-grandfather. [*222*] Manu has said that in the above case the grandfather may be fed at the ceremony for the dead, or, having obtained the permission (of the grandfather, the grandson) can carry out the ritual as he likes. [*223*] Placing into their hands sesame seeds and water on top of grass that serves as a purifier, he should give them the top part of that ball, saying, 'This refreshment for the dead is for them.'

[*224*] Grasping with his own two hands (the dish) filled with food and meditating on the ancestors, he should carefully put it down near where the priests are sitting. [*225*] Evil-minded demons forcibly snatch away the food that is brought without using both hands. [*226*] Purified and with a concentrated mind, he should put down on the ground before (those priests) seasoned foods like soups and vegetables and also milk, yogurt, clarified butter, honey, [*227*] and various foods that are eaten and enjoyed, roots and fruits, tasty meats, and fragrant water. [*228*] Having carefully set all of this down before them, purified and with a well-concentrated mind, he should serve all these dishes, describing all the seasonings. [*229*] He should never let a tear fall (on the food), nor should he get angry or tell a lie; he must not touch the food with his foot nor should he just shake it out. [*230*] A tear makes (the food) go to the dead spirits, anger to his enemies, a lie to the dogs; touching it with his foot, to the ogres, and shaking it, to evil-doers.

[*231*] He should ungrudgingly give the priests whatever they want; he should tell stories and pose Vedic riddles, because the ancestors want this. [*232*] For at a ritual for the ancestors there should be recitations (from the Veda) and the teachings of law, stories, historical tales, myths, and supplementary hymns. [*233*] Contented, he should delight the priests and feed them gradually and slowly, enticing them

over and over again by describing the food and its seasonings. [*234*] At a ceremony for the dead he should try to feed his daughter's son, even if the son is in the midst of a vow (of chastity as a student of the Veda). He should provide him with a seat covered with a cashmere blanket and strew sesame seed on the ground around it. [*235*] There are three purifiers at a ceremony for the dead: the daughter's son, the cashmere seat, and sesame seeds. And for this they also extol the virtues of these three: purification, absence of anger, and absence of haste.

[*236*] All of the food should be served very hot, and those who eat it should do so silently. Even if the donor asks, the twice-born should not say anything about the seasonings of the oblations. [*237*] The ancestors eat that food only if it is hot, eaten in silence, and if there is no comment about the seasonings of the oblations. [*238*] The ogres eat the food that is eaten by someone with his head covered, or when he is facing south, or while he is wearing his sandals. [*239*] Neither a 'Fierce' Untouchable, nor a pig, a cock, a dog, a menstruating woman, or an impotent man should be watching the priests dine. [*240*] Whatever any of these looks upon at an offering into the fire, a gift-giving ceremony, a feast, or an offering for the gods or ancestors goes wrong. [*241*] The pig destroys (the offerings) by sniffing them, the cock with the flapping of his wings, the dog by letting his gaze fall upon them, and a low-class person by his very touch. [*242*] If there should be present a cripple, or a one-eyed man, or a person with too few or too many limbs, he also should be led away from that place, even if he is one of the donor's menial servants.

[*243*] With the permission of the priests (who have been invited), he should revere, to the best of his ability, a priest or a beggar who comes around to be fed. [*244*] Mixing together all the varieties of food and sprinkling it with water, he should pour it all out, strewing it on the ground in front of those who have finished eating. [*245*] The leftovers and the food strewn on the sacrificial grass are the proper portion of those who have died without undergoing the transformative ritual, renouncers, and spinsters. [*246*] What is left over on the ground at the ritual for the ancestors is regarded as the proper portion of the sort of slave who is not crooked or hypocritical.

[*247*] If the ritual called the 'Joining with those who share the same balls' has not yet been done for a twice-born man who has died, only one priest should be fed at the ceremony for the dead and only one ball scattered, without any ritual to the gods. [*248*] But if the ritual of 'Joining with those who share the same balls' has already been performed for him, in keeping with duty, then the sons should scatter the balls in the other way (i.e. as described above).

[*249*] The fool who enjoys a meal at a ceremony for the dead and

then presents the leftovers to a servant goes headfirst to the hell called 'The Thread of Time'. [*250*] If a man climbs into bed with a servant woman on the same day he has enjoyed a meal at a ceremony for the dead, his ancestors have to lie in her excrement for a month.

[*251*] He should ask, 'Have you eaten well?' and then provide water for those satiated priests to rinse their mouths. After they have rinsed their mouths, he says 'Please stay,' and by doing so gives them leave to depart. [*252*] The priests should immediately reply, 'Let there be refreshment for the dead,' for saying, 'Refreshment for the dead' is the highest blessing in all rituals for the ancestors. [*253*] Then he should inform those who have finished eating about what remains of the food, and do with it what the twice-born advise. [*254*] At a ritual for the ancestors, he should say, 'Have you eaten well?'; at a ritual for a cowpen, he should say instead, 'Was it cooked well?'; at one performed on a joyous occasion, he should ask 'Was it perfect?'; and at one for the gods, he should rather say, 'Was it splendid?'

[*255*] The things that make everything go right at rituals in the ceremony for the dead are the afternoon, sacrificial grass, preparing the house, sesame seeds, generous dispensation (of food), wiping and polishing, and the highest sort of twice-born men. [*256*] These should be known as what makes everything go right at offerings to the gods: ceremonial grass, purifiers, the morning, all the kinds of food used for oblations, and the kinds of purifiers mentioned above. [*257*] What is said to be a natural oblation is food eaten by hermits, milk, Soma, undressed meat, and natural salt.

[*258*] When he has seen those priests off, he should turn to the south, and, purified and ritually prepared, filled with expectation, he should request these favours of his ancestors: [*259*] 'May our generous donors prosper! And may the Vedas and our descendants also (prosper)! May our faith not dissipate and may there be much given to us that we might give to others!'

[*260*] When he has completed the scattered offering in this way, he should immediately feed those (remaining) balls to a cow, a priest, a goat, or the fire; or he may toss them into some water. [*261*] Some people put down the balls right after (the meal); others feed them to the birds, or toss them into the fire or into water. [*262*] A faithful wife, married in accordance with law and dedicated to revering the ancestors, may properly eat the middle ball from that (ritual) if she wishes to become pregnant with a son. [*263*] Then she will bring forth a son who will live a long time, who will have fame and wisdom, wealth and progeny, a man of lucidity and religion.

[*264*] When he has washed his hands and rinsed out his mouth, he should make the preparations for (food for) his paternal relatives. And

when he has given it to his paternal relatives with all due honour, he should then also feed his maternal relatives. [*265*] But the leftovers should stay where they are until after the priests have dispersed; only then may one proceed with the propitiatory offering in the house. This is the established law.

[*266*] I will now explain, leaving nothing out, the oblations given, in accordance with the rules, to the ancestors – which ones are effective for a long time, and which ones are everlasting.

[*267*] Sesame seeds, rice, barley, beans, water, roots or fruits given to the ancestors of men in accordance with the rules satisfy them for one month. [*268*] They are satisfied for two months when given the flesh of fish, (they are satisfied for) three months with venison, four with mutton, and five with the flesh of birds; [*269*] six months with goat meat, seven with that of the spotted deer, eight with the meat of the black antelope, and nine with that of the gazelle. [*270*] They are satisfied for ten months with the flesh of boars and buffalo, eleven months with the meat of rabbits and tortoises; [*271*] and for a whole year with cow's milk and food prepared in it. For twelve years they remain satisfied with the meat of a 'leather-nose'. [*272*] The sacred basil, the 'large-scaled' fish, the rhinoceros, the flesh of a red goat, and honey are effective forever, and so are all the kinds of food eaten by hermits.

[*273*] Whatever food mixed with honey one presents on the thirteenth day after the beginning of the monsoon, in July and August, under the constellation of Magha, is also incorruptible (in its effects). [*274*] (The ancestors say) 'May there be born into our family one who will give us food mixed with milk, with honey, or with melted butter on the thirteenth day when the shadow of the elephant is cast towards the east.' [*275*] Whatever a man filled with faith gives properly in accordance with the rules, that becomes the incorruptible and everlasting (food) of the ancestors in the other world. [*276*] The days of the lunar fortnight in which the moon is waning, beginning with the tenth and with the exception of the fourteenth, are recommended for the performance of the ceremony for the dead – these days, and no others. [*277*] A man who performs the ritual for all his ancestors on the even-numbered days and constellations obtains all his desires; if on the uneven (days and constellations), he gets wonderful progeny. [*278*] Just as the second lunar fortnight is better than the first, so too the later portion of the day is better than the earlier for the ceremony for the dead.

[*279*] He should perform the ritual for the ancestors tirelessly, properly, and according to the rules, grasping sacrificial grass in his hands right up to the end, wearing his initiatory thread to the front (on the right shoulder) and ending up towards the south. [*280*] A

ceremony for the dead should not be done at night, for the night is said to belong to the ogres; nor should it be done at the two twilights, nor when the sun has just risen. [*281*] Following these rules, the ceremony for the dead should be given three times a year – in the winter, summer, and rainy season, in addition to the daily one that is included among the five great sacrifices. [*282*] Sacrificial oblations intended for the ancestors should not be put into an ordinary fire; a twice-born man who keeps three or five sacrificial fires should not offer a ceremony for the dead except on the new-moon day.

[*283*] Even when a priest satisifies the ancestors with offerings of water while he is bathing, through that alone he obtains the full reward of performing a sacrifice to the ancestors. [*284*] They call the fathers the Vasus, the grandfathers the Rudras, and the great-grandfathers the Ādityas – thus proclaims the eternal revealed canon. [*285*] He should regularly eat the leftover offerings and the ambrosia: leftover offerings come from what remains from feasts, but ambrosia comes from what remains from sacrifices.

[*286*] Everything about the procedure of the five great sacrifices has thus been described to you. Listen now to the rule about the livelihoods for priests.

End of Chapter 3

[3] The offering made from a cow is the *madhuparka*, the honey--mixture, referred to in 3.119–20.

[4] The period of Veda study culminates in the homecoming ritual discussed at 2.245–6.

[5] In Vedic times, and to some extent in present-day India among certain priests, men traced their descent through a ritual lineage (*gotra*) to one of the seven mythical sages or ṛṣ*is* to whom the Veda was first revealed.

[10] The goose (*haṃsa*) and elephant (*vāraṇa*) walk with a rolling gait that ancient Indian poets considered a sign of beauty in a woman.

[11] If she has no brothers, her father may 'appoint' her to raise sons to be his heirs, and so her sons would be her father's heirs instead of her husband's. If her father is not known, her natural parents may turn out to be related to the bridegroom too closely (i.e. wrongly, involving *adharma*).

[16] Here Manu argues with the authors of other *dharmaśāstras*. The fall may be from caste or into hell.

[18] A man can make certain sacrifices only with the assistance of a wife of the proper class. Offerings of oblations in the sacrificial fire to the gods, of water to the ancestors, and of food from the family's meal to priests who are guests comprise three of the five obligatory daily 'great sacrifices' of the householder. The other two are the propitiatory sacrifice of rice-balls placed on the ground for the disembodied spirits and the sacrifice to the *brahman* or ultimate reality, which is the study and recitation of the Veda. See 3.69–83.

[25] 'Here' means 'in this text'. The three marriages that are right (*dharmya*) among the last five are those of the Lord of Creatures, centaurs, and ogres.

[32] The centaurs (*gandharvas* in Sanskrit, possibly cognate with the Latin *centaurus*) are celestial patrons of music, horses, and sexual love. The term 'Gandharva marriage'

became a euphemism in Sanskrit literature for an otherwise unsanctioned sexual union, i.e. one witnessed only by these creatures.

[33] The verse does not specify the object of this mayhem. Some commentators suggest that it is the people of the house who try to oppose the ogre bridegroom; others suggest that the first two verbs (kill and wound) apply to such people, while the last applies to the house itself, which is broken into.

[35] The first is the Brahmā marriage (3.27), and the second is the centaur (*gandharva*) marriage (3.32).

[45] The lunar junctures are the *parvans*, the new- and full-moon days (and, sometimes, the eighth and fourteenth day of each lunar fortnight; see 4.113–14). Traditionally, in Vedic ritualism, the sacrificer and his wife prepared themselves for the performance of the new- and full-moon sacrifices by various kinds of observances, including sexual abstinence.

[46] The special days are the first four after the beginning of her menstrual period.

[49] The final instance would be a child with no sexual organs at all, or a miscarriage, or no conception at all.

[68] These are slaughter-houses because small creatures are, often inadvertently, killed through their use.

[70] The propitiatory offering to the disembodied spirits (*bhūtas*) is the *bali* offering of portions of food scattered on the ground.

[72] The observant reader will note that this list of five differs from that given directly above. The dependants may be those whom he is bound to support, such as servants or aged relatives or animals, or the disembodied spirits (*bhūtas*) referred to in previous verses.

[73] These compounds roughly translate the technical terms in Sanskrit: the *ahuta*, the *huta*, the *prahuta*, the *brāhmyahuta*, and the *prāśita*.

[78] Knowledge (*jnāna*) here refers to the daily recitation of the Veda.

[79] 'Feeble sensory powers' (*durbalendriya*) may refer to general weakness or to the failure to control the sense organs. 'Incorruptible', in the seventeenth-century sense, seems the best word to capture the meaning of *akṣaya*, literally 'not-decaying', with the added meaning of transcending the inevitable dissolution of worldly things.

[83] The ritual to the All-gods (*vaiśvadeva*) is an offering of food to the gods that is to be performed daily at sunrise, noon, and sunset. The verse indicates that these two rituals are to be kept separate, and hence one should not feed the two sets of priests at once.

[84] The household fire (*gṛhyāgni*) is the fire set at the time of marriage (see 3.67), the fire in which the householder performs the domestic rituals and the five great sacrifices, as well as ordinary cooking. It should be distinguished from the householder's fire (*gārhapatyāgni*) (2.231).

[85] Fire and Soma together form the dual deity to whom the *agniṣṭoma* is offered. Dhanvantari is the physician of the gods.

[86] Kuhu is the goddess of the new-moon day, Anumati the goddess of the full-moon day, and Agni Sviṣṭakṛt is the Fire of the Perfected Offerings.

[87] The offering is made clockwise, literally 'to the right' (*pradakṣiṇam*), proceeding from the east to the south (the south being called *dakṣiṇa*). The deities thus honoured are Indra in the east, Death (Antaka, 'The Ender', more often called Yama) in the south, the Lord of the Waters (Āppati, more often called Varuṇa) in the west, and the Moon (Indu, more often called Soma) in the north.

[88] The Maruts are storm gods, servants of Indra.

[89] The 'head' and 'foot' are most likely the top and bottom of the house, in contrast with the centre mentioned in the next part of the verse; but commentators suggest that these terms may refer to the head and foot of the marriage bed, or to the place where

the Lord of the House (Vāstoṣpati, the benevolent spirit of the dwelling place) puts his head and foot. Śrī is the goddess of fortune, and Bhadrakālī a benevolent form of Kālī (the Dark Goddess).

[91] The spirit of All Food is Sarvānnabhūti; some manuscripts read Sarvātmabhūti, Spirit of All Souls.

[92] 'Dog-cooker' is generally a term of opprobrium for Untouchables; Manu uses it to designate a particular caste of Untouchables (9.19, 51–6). The evils that make a man ill may have been committed in this life or a previous life; smallpox and leprosy are particularly indicated in this way.

[95] The rule is that a student should give his guru a present (a *gurudakṣiṇā*), preferably a cow, at the end of his period of study of the Veda. See 2.246.

[97] See 3.168 for the metaphor of the priest whose sacrificial fire has been extinguished.

[100] That is, the mistreated guest takes away the bad host's good credit for good past actions (and, as is stated in other texts, he transfers to that host his own bad credit for bad past actions). The one who makes offerings in five fires is the *āhitāgni*.

[103] The term translated as 'convivial' (*sāngatika*) may rather designate someone who comes on business or is a member of one's own group. The house with a wife and sacrificial fires is the home of a householder who has established his sacrificial hearth.

[104] That is, in the other world, or in their next birth, they are reborn as animals who will be thus eaten.

[109] The name of the family is the *kula*, and the lineage of the sages is the *gotra*.

[115] He will be eaten like this after his death, or in the other world.

[119] The honey-mixture is the *madhuparka*, an offering of honey and milk given to certain guests.

[122] The 'offering after the balls' is the *piṇḍānvāhārya*. The word for 'ball' is *piṇḍa*, usually a rice-ball, often used to define not only this ceremony but the basic relationship between males in a family (*sapiṇḍas*, 'co-feeders'). See 3.215–20.

[133] This could be the spirit of the dead person to whom the offering to the ancestors is being offered at this moment, or the spirit, when he dies in the future, of the person now making an offering to the gods.

[141] That is, it does not move on to the next world.

[146] The effect that the ceremony of the dead has upon seven generations is mentioned in 1.105 and 3.138. These seven generations are those joined through the designation of 'co-feeder' (*sapiṇḍa*).

[150] *Klība*, usually translated as 'eunuch', is not a eunuch; there is no evidence that there were eunuchs in India before the Arab invasions many centuries after Manu. The term designates a 'non-man' (*na-puṃsaka* is given by all the commentators on this verse as a synonym for *klība*), that is, a sexually dysfunctional male, who might be, according to the context, impotent, homosexual, a transvestite, or, in some cases, a man with mutilated or defective sexual organs. (One commentator on this verse gives, in addition to *na-puṃsaka*, several glosses: a hermaphrodite, a man with blighted semen, and a *ṣaṇḍa*). One dictionary describes fourteen different kinds of *klības*, one of whom is a *mukhabhaga* (a man who allows his mouth to be used as a vagina) and resorts to boys. Male homosexuals are scorned in the *Kāmasūtra*, and female homosexuals are scorned by Manu (8.369).

[152] The 'priests who attend on idols' are the regular Hindu priests of the *bhakti* cults.

[153] A man who has abandoned his (sacrificial) fire might be an apostate or simply a renouncer. Mangled teeth and discoloured nails are evidence of crimes committed in former lives; see 11.49.

[154] The terms *parivettṛ* and *parivitti* (designating a man who usurps his older brother's place, and that older brother) are defined at 3.171. The member of an association might belong to a religious sect or be a tradesman, the leader of a caravan, a village

headman, or a man who (fraudulently) lives off the money that belongs to his guild.

[156] The last two are the *kuṇḍa* and *golaka*, defined at 3.174.

[157] See 2.40 for Vedic and sexual bonds.

[159] The seller of spices may also sell liquors or poisons.

[160] The term translated as 'a man who marries his older brother's widow' (*didhiṣūpati* or *agredidhiṣūpati*) may also designate the husband of a younger sister who married before her elder sister, though this fits badly with the definition in 3.173. The man who shoots dice may also run a gambling house.

[164] The groups of goblins are *gaṇas*, troops of often malevolent minor spirits, sometimes in the service of the gods Śiva or Gaṇeśa.

[171] These are the *parivettṛ* and *parivitti*.

[173] The man who marries his older brother's widow (the *didhiṣūpati*) is mentioned in 3.160. The laws regarding an appointed woman (*niyuktā*) are discussed at 9.57–68.

[174] These are the *kuṇḍa* and *golaka* of 3.156.

[175] The sower of the seed is the biological father, who may or may not be the legal husband; the woman is the field, and the owner of the field is the legal husband. The son born in the field (*kṣetraja*) is defined at 9.167 and discussed at length at 9.32–55.

[185] The story of Naciketas is told in the *Kaṭha Upaniṣad*; the 'three-bird' passage is the *trisuparṇa* section of the *ṛg Veda* (10.114.3–5); the 'most excellent' chants (the *jyeṣṭha-sāmans*) are said to be in the Vedic books called Āraṇyakas, or, more specifically, to be *Tāṇḍya Brāhmaṇa* 21.2.3.

[194] The God of the Golden Womb (Hiraṇyagarbha) is also said to be a golden egg or the source of golden seed. See 1.8–13.

[195] The 'Soma-seated' are the *somasads*; the Amenables are the *sādhyas*; the 'Tasted-by-Fire' the *agniṣvattas*; for Virāj, a primeval creator, see 1.32–3.

[196] The 'Seated-on-Sacrificial-Grass' are the *barhiṣads*. The titans are *dānavas* (literally, sons of Danu).

[197] The 'Soma-drinkers' are *somapas*; the 'Oblation-eaters', *havirbhujes*; 'Drinkers-of-Melted-Butter', *ājyapas*; and 'Those-who-have-a-Good Time', *sukālins*.

[198] The 'Oblation-eaters' in this verse are called *haviṣmants* rather than *havirbhujes*.

[199] The 'Fire-burnt' are *agnidagdhas*, the 'Non-fire-burnt' *anagnidagdhas*, and those 'Connected-with-Soma' *saumyas*.

[204] There may be a pun here on 'protection' (*ārakṣa*) and 'ogre' (*rakṣas*).

[212] Here 'twice-born' almost certainly means nothing but a priest (Brahmin).

[214] The rituals are performed *apasavya*, literally, 'from the left', which means finishing to the right, or the south. The term may also imply that the celebrant is also *prācīnāvītin*, 'wearing the initiatory thread to the east or front', i.e. on the right shoulder, the reverse of the normal position; the two terms occur together at 3.279.

[216] The sacrificial grass (*darbha*) is probably the grass on which the balls were put down. The ancestors who live on the wipings are the great-grandfather, great-great-grandfather, and great-great-great-grandfather.

[217] The six seasons are spring (*vasanta*, March—May), summer (*grīṣma*, May–July), the rains or monsoon (*varṣa*, July–September), autumn (*śarad*, September–November), winter (*hemānta*, November–January), and the cool season (*śiśira*, January–March).

[220] The ancestors who precede the father are the grandfather, great-grandfather, and great-great grandfather. If he feeds his own father, he presumably feeds him with the portion of his own rice-ball.

[223] The refreshment for the dead is the *svadhā*. 'Svadhā!', the ritual ejaculation accompanying offerings to ancestors, is the complementary opposite to 'Svāhā!' or 'Vaṣaṭ!', the ritual ejaculation accompanying offerings to gods.

[234] The cashmere blanket is made of the special wool from Nepal called *kutapa*.

[239] The ‘Fierce’ Untouchable here is a *caṇḍāla*, the paradigmatic Untouchable, and hence often used as the generic term for any Untouchable.

[245] The omitted transformative ritual may be the original initiation into the study of the Veda or the final ceremony of cremation. The two final classes (renouncers and spinsters) may perhaps be better rendered in combination: those who abandon family women.

[247] The ‘Joining with those who share the same balls’ (*sapiṇḍīkaraṇa*) is a ritual, performed for a man thirteen days or a year after his death, that allows him to forge a bond with his male ancestors who receive the same balls of rice at the ceremony for the dead, the ‘co-feeders’ (*sapiṇḍas*).

[249] ‘The Thread of Time’ is *kālasūtra*.

[254] The ritual dedicated to the cowpen may be for the welfare of cattle or for the sake of a more general purification; the joyous occasions may include marriage or more general prosperity.

[256] ‘Above’ here probably refers to the previous verse, though other relevant purifiers have also been mentioned elsewhere in the text.

[271] The ‘leather-nose’ is said by some commentators to be a white he-goat with long ears or a bird with a black neck, white wings, and a red head. Monier-Williams’s dictionary (citing only this verse in Manu) suggests that it may be a rhinoceros, but this is unlikely in light of the fact that the rhinoceros (*khaḍga*) occurs in the very next verse.

[272] The sacred basil (*kālaśāka*) is the herb Ocimum Sanctum; the ‘large-scaled’ fish (*mahāśalka*) may be a sea-crab or prawn.

[273] Mid-July to mid-September is the rainy season or the monsoon (*varṣa*). Mid-August to mid-September is the month when the moon is in Magha, not the month of Magha but the month of Prauṣṭhapada.

[274] Shadows fall to the east in the afternoon. This day is, according to various texts, a particular day when the sun is in the constellation of ‘the Elephant’s Trunk’ (*hasta*), in the month of January–February (Magha); others say it is an expression for a solar eclipse.

[275] It is interesting to note in this paragraph the progression of options so typical of Manu, from the most demanding to ‘Whatever … he gives’, which also becomes ‘incorruptible and everlasting’.

[279] The last two phrases translate *prācīnāvītin* and *apasavyam*.

[282] There is an implicit contrast here between the ordinary fire and the sacrificial fire of the man who keeps three or five sacrificial fires (the *āhitāgni*).

[283] Here, as in 3.275, the simplest ritual is equated with the hardest and most complicated.

CHAPTER 4

[*1*] When a twice-born man has spent the first quarter of his life with his guru, he should take a wife and live out the second quarter of life at home. [*2*] A priest should make his living by taking up a profession which causes no harm, or very little harm, to living beings – except in extremity. [*3*] He may accumulate some wealth through pursuit of the innate activities that are proper for him and not contemptible, but without any undue bodily stress and only for the purpose of attaining a minimal subsistence. [*4*] He may make a living by (pursuing the occupations called) 'lawful', 'immortal', 'mortal', 'deadly', or also the one called 'simultaneously good and unlawful', but not by the one called 'the dog's way of life'. [*5*] (Subsisting by merely) gleaning (corn) and gathering (single grains) should be known as the 'lawful' (way of life); (living off) unsolicited gifts would be the 'immortal' (way of life); begging for alms is the 'mortal' (way of life); farming the land is traditionally known as the 'deadly' mode of life. [*6*] Trade is the 'simultaneously good and unlawful' (way of life), but one may make a living even in this way. Servility is called 'the dog's way of life', and therefore one should avoid it.

[*7*] (The householder) may have enough grain to fill a granary, or just enough to fill a jar. Or he may have enough to last for three days, or he may not even have anything for tomorrow. [*8*] And of these four twice-born domestic sacrificers, each one should be regarded as superior to the one mentioned before him and as the better conqueror of the world through religion. [*9*] The first of them engages in all six innate activities (listed above); the second in (the first) three; the third in (the first) two; and the fourth lives solely by means of the extended sacrifice consisting of his daily recitation of the Veda. [*10*] Even the man who subsists by gleaning (corn) and gathering (single grains) should regularly perform the daily fire sacrifice, and he should always make the propitiatory offerings of the sacrifices at the (lunar) junctures and at the solstices. [*11*] He should never take up a worldly calling just to make a living. Rather, he should live the clean life of a proper priest, neither crooked nor hypocritical. [*12*] In order to be happy, a man must maintain perfect contentment and become self-controlled. For contentment is the very root of happiness, and the opposite of contentment is the root of all unhappiness.

[*13*] A twice-born Vedic graduate, making a living by means of one or another of the occupations (mentioned above), should adopt the following ways of behaving, which win for him fame, long life, and a place in heaven. [*14*] Tirelessly he should carry out the obligatory activities that have been prescribed for him in the Veda, for by doing

this to the best of his ability he attains the ultimate level of existence. [*15*] He should not pursue wealth addictively, nor by engaging in forbidden activities; nor, even when engaged in activities that are sanctioned by the rules, (should he take money) from this source or that, not even in great distress.

[*16*] He should not, out of desire, become addicted to any of the sensory objects; let him rather turn over in his mind what is entailed in becoming excessively addicted to them. [*17*] He should renounce completely all pursuits that obstruct his private recitation (of the Veda), for no matter how he makes his living, he must always fulfil this obligation. [*18*] He should behave here on earth in such a way as to bring his clothing, speech, and thoughts into conformity with his age, innate activity, wealth, learning, and ancestry. [*19*] He should regularly take into consideration the teachings that rapidly promote increased intelligence, wealth, and welfare, and also the treatises on the meaning of the Veda. [*20*] For the more a man concentrates upon a teaching, the more he comes to understand it, and his understanding is radiant.

[21] He should never be remiss about performing the sacrifices for the sages, gods, disembodied spirits, men, and ancestors, to the best of his ability. [*22*] Some people, those who know the teachings about the sacrifices, effortlessly and perpetually offer these great sacrifices just within their sensory powers. [*23*] Seeing that ceasing the actual performance of sacrifice and (sacrificing) in speech and breath is the incorruptible (sacrifice), some perpetually offer breath in speech, speech in breath. [*24*] Other priests, who have seen with the eye of their own knowledge that these rites are rooted in knowledge, always perform these sacrifices using knowledge as the only offering.

[*25*] A twice-born man should always offer the daily fire sacrifice at the beginning and end of each day and night, and the new- and full-moon sacrifices at the end of each half-month; [*26*] a sacrificial offering of first-fruits at the harvest of the (old) crop, sacrifices at the end of the season, an animal sacrifice at the end of each half-year, and a Soma sacrifice every year. [*27*] A twice-born man who keeps the fires and wants to live a long life should not eat meat or food made of new grain if he has not offered the sacrifice of first-fruits and the animal sacrifice. [*28*] For if his fires are left unhonoured by first-fruits and animal offerings, they seek to consume the vital breath (of the sacrificer) out of greediness for food made from first-fruits and for flesh.

[*29*] No guest should reside in his house without being honoured, to the best of his ability, with a seat, food, a bed, water, and roots and fruits. [*30*] He should not give honour, even with mere words, to heretics, people who persist in wrong action, people who act like cats,

hypocrites, rationalists, and people who live like herons. [*31*] He should revere, with rituals for the gods and ancestors, domestic sacrificers who know the Veda by heart, who have learned the Veda, completed their vows, and graduated; and he should shun those who are their opposites. [*32*] A domestic sacrificer should give what he can to those who do not cook for themselves, and distribute food to all living beings in such a way that it does him no damage.

[*33*] A Vedic graduate who is fainting with hunger may seek funds from a king, from a patron for whom he offers sacrifices, or from a pupil who lives in his house – but not from anyone else. This is the fixed rule. [*34*] If it is at all in his power, a priest who is a Vedic graduate should not be fainting with hunger, nor should he be seen in dirty old clothes if he owns anything. [*35*] Keeping his hair, nails, and beard trimmed, self-restrained, clothed in white, unpolluted, he should be constantly engaged in the private recitation (of the Veda) and in (other) things for his own benefit. [*36*] He should carry a bamboo staff, a gourd filled with water, the initiatory thread, a broom made of sacrificial grass, and two bright gold earrings. [*37*] He should never look at the sun when it is rising or setting, nor when it is eclipsed, nor when it is reflected in water, nor at noon. [*38*] He should not jump over a rope tethering a calf, nor run around in the rain, nor stare at his own image in water. This is a rule that should be kept. [*39*] When he encounters a mound of earth, a cow, an image of a god, a priest, clarified butter, honey, a crossroads, or famous trees he should circumambulate them to the right, clockwise.

[*40*] Even if he is out of his mind (with desire) he should not have sex with a woman who is menstruating; he should not even lie down in the same bed with her. [*41*] A man who has sex with a woman awash in menstrual blood loses his wisdom, brilliant energy, strength, eyesight, and long life. [*42*] By shunning her when she is awash in menstrual blood, he increases his wisdom, brilliant energy, strength, eyesight, and long life. [*43*] He should not eat with his wife, nor watch her when she eats, sneezes, yawns, or sits down to relax. [*44*] A priest who desires brilliant energy should not look at a woman putting on her eye make-up, rubbing oil on herself, undressed, or giving birth.

[*45*] He should not eat wearing only one garment, nor take a bath naked. He should not urinate on the road, on ashes, in a cowpen, [*46*] on ploughed land, in water, on a mound piled up for the dead, on a hill, on the ruins of a temple, nor on an ant hill, ever, [*47*] nor in a cave inhabited by living creatures, while moving or standing up, from the bank of a river, or on the summit of a mountain. [*48*] He should never emit excrement or urine while facing the wind or looking at fire, a priest, the sun, water, or cows. [*49*] He should relieve himself only when he has covered the ground with things like sticks, clods of

earth, leaves and grass, when he is purified and silent, keeping the parts of his body covered, and concealed from sight. [*50*] During the day, he should discharge his urine and excrement while facing north, at night facing south, and at the two twilights as during the day. [*51*] In the shade or under cover of darkness, and also whenever he fears for his life, a twice-born man may do it facing any way he likes, no matter whether it is day or night. [*52*] Urinating on fire, or at the sun or moon, or in water, or at a twice-born man, or on a cow, or into the wind, destroys a man's wits.

[*53*] He should not blow on fire with his mouth, nor look at a naked woman. He should not toss anything unfit for sacrifice into the fire, nor warm his feet by it. [*54*] He should not put (fire) under anything, nor jump over it, nor put it too near to his feet. He should not go around annoying creatures that have the breath of life. [*55*] He should not eat, travel, or lie down during the twilight periods, nor should he draw in the dust or rip off his garland. [*56*] He should not throw urine, excrement, or saliva into water, nor anything else that is smeared with impurity, nor blood or poisons.

[*57*] He should not sleep alone in an empty house, nor awaken a superior. He should not carry on a conversation with a menstruating woman, and he should not go to a sacrifice if he has not been invited. [*58*] His right arm should remain uncovered when he is in a place where fire is kept or in a cowpen, in the presence of priests, while privately reciting (the Veda), or while eating. [*59*] He should not hinder a cow suckling (her calf), nor should he tell anyone about it. An intelligent man who spots a rainbow in the sky should not show it to anyone else. [*60*] He should not stay in a village where there is irreligion, nor for very long in a place where disease is rife; he should not take to the open road alone, or live for a long time on a mountain.

[*61*] He should not live in a kingdom ruled by a servant, or in a place run by people who oppose law or overrun by gangs of heretics or swarming with men of the lowest castes. [*62*] He should not eat food that has had its oil extracted from it, nor go on eating after he is full. He should not eat too early in the morning or too late in the evening, nor eat in the evening if he has eaten that morning. [*63*] He should not uselessly run around doing things. He should not drink water with his hands cupped, or eat food that is on his lap, nor should he ever indulge in idle curiosity. [*64*] He should not dance or sing or play musical instruments or clap his hands, or growl inarticulately, or argue passionately. [*65*] He should never wash his feet in a brass basin, nor eat off a plate that is broken or that looks dirty. [*66*] He should not wear second-hand shoes or clothes, or use a second-hand initiatory thread, ornament, garland, or water pot.

[*67*] He should not travel with harness animals that are untrained,

suffering from hunger or disease, or that have broken horns, bad eyes, faulty hooves, or deformed tails. [*68*] He should, on the other hand, always travel with animals that are well trained and swift, that have good markings, colour, and general appearance, and that move along without much use of the whip.

[*69*] The young sun, the smoke from (the cremation of) dead bodies, and a broken chair should be avoided. He should not cut his nails or hair, nor bite his fingernails. [*70*] He should not trample clumps of earth or tear up grass with his fingernails. He should not engage in activities that are fruitless or that will bring unhappy future consequences. [*71*] A man who goes around trampling clumps of earth, tearing up grass, and biting his nails is soon ruined, and so is an informer and a man who has become polluted.

[*72*] He should not engage in quarrelsome conversation, or wear a garland on the outside of his clothes, and riding on the back of a cow is altogether despicable. [*73*] He should not enter a closed village or house except by the door; and at night he should keep his distance from the roots of trees. [*74*] He should never shoot dice or take off his shoes by himself. He should not eat lying in bed, nor should he eat what has been placed in his hand or on a seat. [*75*] He should not eat anything that contains sesame seeds after the sun has gone down. He should not lie down naked or go anywhere with food still on his mouth and hands. [*76*] A man may eat when his feet are still wet (from washing), but he should not lie down when his feet are still wet. A man who eats while his feet are still wet lives a long life. [*77*] He should never enter a place that his gaze cannot penetrate or that is inaccessible, nor should he look at urine or excrement or swim across a river using his two arms. [*78*] A person who wants to live a long life will avoid stepping on hair, ashes, bones, skulls, cotton seeds, and chaff.

[*79*] He should not live with people who have fallen, nor with 'Fierce' Untouchables, 'Tribals', fools, arrogant men, men of the lowest castes, and 'Those Who End Up at the Bottom'. [*80*] He should not share his opinions with a servant, nor the leftovers from his meals, or oblations; nor should he instruct him about his duty or assign a vow to him. [*81*] For a man who teaches a servant his duty or assigns a vow to him sinks with him into that dark hell called 'Exposed'. [*82*] He should not scratch his head with both his hands joined or touch it with food still on his hands; nor should he bathe without washing it too. [*83*] He should avoid pulling (anyone's) hair and beating (anyone's) head. And after he has washed his head (with oil), he should not touch any part of his body whatsoever with the oil.

[*84*] He should not accept (gifts) from a king who was begotten by those who are not of the ruling class, nor from people who run

slaughter-houses, oil-presses, or taverns, nor from those who live off whorehouses. [*85*] An oil-press is the same as ten slaughter-houses, a tavern is the same as ten oil-presses, a whorehouse is the same as ten taverns, and a king is the same as ten whorehouses. [*86*] A king is traditionally regarded as the equal of a butcher who runs ten thousand slaughter-houses. To accept (gifts) from him is a horrible thing.

[*87*] He who accepts (gifts) from a greedy king who has veered away from the authoritative teachings goes, one after another, to these twenty-one hells: [*88*] 'Darkness', 'Blind Darkness', 'Belonging to the Great Spotted Deer', 'Belonging to the Deer', the hell called 'the Thread of Time', 'the Great Hell', [*89*] 'Vivifying', 'the Great Washing Away', 'Burning', 'Excessively Burning', 'Crushing', 'Joined with the Raven', 'Shut Up Like a Bud', 'Stinking Earth', [*90*] 'Iron Spike', 'Dregs', 'Impelling', 'Thorny River', 'Forest of Sword Leaves', and 'Tearing with Iron'. [*91*] Knowing this, learned priests who expound the Veda and who hope for the best after death do not accept (gifts) from kings.

[*92*] He should wake up at the moment of Brahmā and reflect upon religion and profit and the trouble that they cause for the body, and upon the true meaning of the Veda. [*93*] When he has arisen, taken care of the necessities, and made himself unpolluted, he should stand with a concentrated mind during the morning twilight and chant Vedic verses for a long time; and (he should do so again) at the proper time for the evening (twilight). [*94*] Because of the length of their twilight rituals, the sages won long life, wisdom, fame, renown, and the splendour of the Veda.

[*95*] When he has performed the ritual that inaugurates the period of Veda study on (the full-moon day) in mid-July to mid-August or mid-August to mid-September in accordance with the rule, a priest should diligently engage in the recitation of the Vedic chants for four and a half months. [*96*] When the moon comes into the house of Puṣya in mid-December to mid-January, or on the first day of the fortnight of the waxing moon in mid-January to mid-February, in the forenoon of the day, outside (the village or town), a twice-born man should perform the ritual that closes the period of Veda chants. [*97*] When he has thus performed the ritual that closes the period of Veda chants, outside (the village or town), in accordance with the teaching, he should cease (study) for the rest of that day, that night, and the following day; (or) for (only) that very day and the following night. [*98*] From that time on he should, restrained, recite the Vedic chants during the fortnights of the waxing moon, and recite all the supplements to the Veda during the fortnights of the waning moon.

[*99*] He should not recite indistinctly, nor in the presence of those of the servant class; nor should he sleep again when he is exhausted at

the end of the night from reciting the Veda. [*100*] He should always recite (the portion of the Veda) composed in meters, according to the rule stated above. For a twice-born man who is not in extremity should diligently (recite) both (the portion of the Veda containing) the explanation and the portion composed in meters.

[*101*] Both the student and the one who, following the rule, imparts the lessons to pupils should try to avoid the obligatory recitation on the following occasions when there is to be no recitation. [*102*] Those who know about recitation regard these as two occasions when there is to be no recitation in the rainy season: when the wind whistles in the ears at night, and when dust is kicked up during the day. [*103*] Manu has said that when there is lightning, thunder, and rain, or when there is a shower of giant meteors, these are occasions (in the rainy season) when there is to be no recitation up until that time the next day. [*104*] If these things have occurred just as the fires are re-enlivened, or also when rain clouds appear in the wrong season, it should be realized that there is to be no recitation.

[*105*] When there is a destructive storm, an earthquake, or an eclipse of the sun or moon, even when they occur in the rainy season, it should be known that these are occasions when there is to be no recitation until that time the next day. [*106*] But when there is (only) the sound of lightning and thunder (and not accompanying rain) as the fires are re-enlivened, there should be no recitation for as long as the sun or moon is up; when there is the remaining (phenomenon, i.e. rain, there should be no recitation) for a day and a night. [*107*] For those who want the greatest merit from fulfilling their duties, there is the obligation to cease recitation in villages or towns; and for everyone when there is a stench. [*108*] There is to be no recitation in a village in which there is a corpse, in the vicinity of a servant, when there is wailing, or in a crowd of people.

[*109*] A person should not even think about (reciting the Veda) in water, during the middle of the night, while expelling urine or excrement, when food is still left on his mouth and hands, or while eating at a ceremony for the dead. [*110*] A learned twice-born man should not recite for three days when he has accepted an invitation to a ceremony for one dead person, or when the king (has been polluted) by a birth, or when (the planet) Rāhu causes a lunar or solar eclipse. [*111*] A learned priest should not recite the Veda for as long as the smell and food-stains of the ceremony for one dead person cling to his body. [*112*] There should be no recitation in bed, while one's feet are propped up, when squatting, when one has eaten flesh or the food of a woman who has just given birth, [*113*] when there is fog, when arrows are whizzing by, at either of the twilights, on the days of the new and full moon, and on the eighth and fourteenth days (of each

lunar fortnight). [*114*] The new-moon day destroys the guru, the fourteenth day destroys the pupil, the full-moon day and the eighth day (after the full moon destroy) the Veda. He should therefore avoid those (days). [*115*] A twice-born man should not recite (the Veda) when it rains dust, when the sky glows red, when jackals howl, when dogs, donkeys, or camels cry out, or when he is in a group.

[*116*] He should not recite in a cremation ground, a village, or a cowpen; nor while wearing a garment that he has worn in sexual union, nor while accepting (anything) at a ceremony for the dead. [*117*] He should not recite even while taking something (that is given) at a ceremony for the dead, whatever it is, whether it has the breath of life or not. For the hand is traditionally regarded as the mouth of the twice-born. [*118*] When the village is overrun by thieves, when there is chaos due to fire, and in all cases of supernatural omens, one should know not to recite until that time the next day. [*119*] At the rituals inaugurating and closing the period of Veda study it is traditionally said that there should be a hiatus of three nights; on the 'eighths' and the nights ending each season, a day and night.

[*120*] A person mounted on a horse should not recite, nor anyone on a tree, an elephant, a boat, a donkey, or a camel, or standing on salty ground; nor anyone travelling in a carriage; [*121*] nor when there is an argument or a fight, nor in the midst of an army or a battle; nor when one has just eaten or has not digested (his food) or has vomited or belched; [*122*] nor without the permission of one's guest; nor when the wind blows strongly; nor when blood flows from one's limbs or when one has been wounded by a weapon.

[*123*] He should never recite the ṛg *Veda* or *Yajur Veda* while there is the sound of the *Sāma Veda* (being chanted); nor when he has recited up to the end of a Veda or when he has recited a Wilderness Book. [*124*] The ṛg *Veda* has the gods as its deity, the *Yajur Veda* is for humans, but the *Sāma Veda* is traditionally said to belong to the ancestors, and thus the sound of it is polluted. [*125*] Knowing this, learned men daily first recite the essences of the three (Vedas), in order, and afterwards recite the Veda.

[*126*] It should be known that there is to be no recitation for a day and night when a sacrificial animal, frog, cat, dog, snake, mongoose, or rat passes between (teacher and student). [*127*] A twice-born man should always take pains to avoid two (occasions) when the recitation should cease: when the place where he recites privately is unclean and when he himself is polluted.

[*128*] A twice-born Vedic graduate should always remain chaste on the new- and full-moon days and on the eighth and fourteenth days (of each lunar fortnight), even during (his wife's) fertile season. [*129*]

He should not go for a bath after eating, nor when ill, nor in the middle of the night, nor always fully dressed, nor in an unknown body of water. [*130*] He should not intentionally step on the shadow of the (images of) deities, nor of a guru, king, Vedic graduate, teacher, tawny (creature), or anyone consecrated for a Soma sacrifice. [*131*] He should not linger at a crossroads in the middle of the day or the middle of the night, when he has eaten the flesh at a ceremony for the dead, or at either twilight. [*132*] He should not intentionally step in massage oils, bath water, excrement or urine, blood, nor in things with phlegm or saliva on them. [*133*] He should not dote upon an enemy, an enemy's assistant, an irreligious man, a thief, or another man's woman. [*134*] For it should be known that there is nothing whatsoever here on earth more conducive to shortening life than doting upon another man's wife.

[*135*] A man who wishes to get on well should never despise a ruler, a snake, or a priest extremely learned in the Veda, even if they are weak. [*136*] For this triad, when despised, burns a man to cinders; therefore no intelligent man will ever despise this triad. [*137*] Nor should anyone despise himself for previous imperfections. One should strive for good fortune up until death, and not presuppose that it is too difficult to obtain. [*138*] A man should tell the truth and speak with kindness; he should not tell the truth unkindly nor utter lies out of kindness. This is a constant duty. [*139*] 'Blessings, blessings,' he should say, or 'Blessings,' is all he should say. He should not engage in fruitless enmity or argument with anyone.

[*140*] He should not ordinarily go out too early in the morning, too late at night, or just at midday; nor with a stranger, alone, or accompanied by servants. [*141*] He should not insult people who have too few or too many parts of the body, nor those who have too little learning or are too old, nor those who have too little beauty or wealth, or too low a birth.

[*142*] A priest who still has food on his mouth and hands should not touch cows, priests, or fire with his hand; nor, when he is healthy, should he even look at the celestial lights when he is polluted. [*143*] But if he has touched these while he is polluted, he should always wash the openings of his body, all the limbs, and the navel, with water held in the palm of his hand. [*144*] A man who is not ill should not touch the orifices of his own body without cause, and he should avoid his pubic hairs.

[145] He should engage diligently in auspicious conduct, self-control, and the conquest of his sensory powers. Tirelessly he should chant (Vedic verses) daily and offer sacrifices into the fire. [*146*] There will be no downfall for those who always engage diligently in auspicious conduct, self-control, chanting, and offering sacrifices.

[*147*] Tirelessly he should chant the Veda daily at the proper time, for they say that that is his supreme duty; any other (duty) is said to be a subsidiary duty. [*148*] A person comes to remember his prior births through daily recitation of the Veda, purification, the generation of inner heat, and absence of malice to living beings. [*149*] Remembering his prior births, a twice-born man who recites the Veda attains perpetual, unending happiness through that recitation of the Veda.

[*150*] On the days of the (lunar) junctures, he should always make offerings to the sun-god and offerings into the fire for the pacification (of evil beings); and on the 'eighths' and 'after-eighths' he should always honour the ancestors.

[*151*] He should dispose of his urine far away from his dwelling place, far away (the water) used to wash his feet, far away the water used to wash away the leftovers of food. [*152*] Only in the morning should he clean his anus, anoint and adorn his body, take his bath, brush his teeth, put on his eye make-up, and worship the deities. [*153*] And in order to remain protected, on the days of the (lunar) junctures he should reverently approach the deities, priests who are religious, the lord of the land, and his gurus. [*154*] He should respectfully welcome eminent men, give them his own seat, sit down next to them with palms folded together, and when they leave he should follow behind them.

[*155*] Tirelessly he should engage in the good conduct appropriate to his own innate activities that has been thoroughly set down in the revealed canon and tradition and that is the very root of religion. [*156*] For from (good) conduct, he obtains longevity; from (good) conduct, desirable progeny; from (good) conduct, incorruptible wealth. For (good) conduct destroys a bad mark. [*157*] Indeed, a man of bad conduct becomes the object of reproach among people; he is always ill, and has an unhappy fortune and a short life. [*158*] Even if he has no (good) distinguishing marks, a man of good conduct who is faithful and without resentment lives for a hundred years.

[*159*] He should take pains to avoid any activity under another person's control, but he should take pains to engage in any (activity) under his own control. [*160*] Everything under another person's control is unhappiness, and everything under one's own control is happiness; it should be known that this sums up the distinguishing marks of unhappiness and happiness. [*161*] Whatever activity satisfies him inwardly when he is doing it should be done zealously; but he should avoid the (activity) which is the opposite.

[*162*] He should not do violence to his teacher, the one who explains (the Veda), his father, mother, guru, priests, cows, or all

those engaged in generating inner heat. [*163*] He should avoid atheism, reviling of the Veda, contempt of the deities, hatred, obstinacy, pride, anger, and sharpness. [*164*] He should not threaten another man with punishment or strike him down in anger, with the exception of his son or pupil. These two he may beat for the sake of instruction.

[*165*] A twice-born man who has threatened a priest with intent to kill is reborn for a hundred years in the hell called 'Darkness'. [*166*] If, in a rage, he intentionally strikes (a priest), even if it is only with a blade of grass, he is born in the wombs of evil people for twenty-one births. [*167*] If a man draws blood from the body of a priest who is not fighting, he experiences very great unhappiness after death for his stupidity. [*168*] As many grains of dust as the blood coagulates on the ground, for so many years will the man who caused the bloodshed be eaten by others in the other world. [*169*] Therefore a learned man should never even threaten a twice-born (priest), he should not beat (a priest), even with a blade of grass, and he should not cause blood to flow from (a priest's) body.

[*170*] For an irreligious man, a man whose wealth is dishonestly gained, or a sadist does not achieve happiness here on earth. [*171*] Even when he is sinking through the practice of religion, he should not set his mind on irreligion, seeing how quickly the tables are turned on evil, irreligious men. [*172*] Irreligious practices do not yield their fruits right away in this world, like a cow, but, turning back on him little by little, they sever the roots of the perpetrator. [*173*] If not on himself, then on his sons; and if not on his sons, on his grandsons, but in every case the irreligion that has been perpetrated never fails to bear fruit for the perpetrator. [*174*] A man thrives for a while through irreligion; he sees good fortune because of it and he conquers enemies because of it; but finally he and his roots are annihilated.

[*175*] He should take pleasure only in the truth, religion, occupations proper for an Aryan, and purification. He should instruct his pupils in accordance with the law, restraining his speech, arms, and stomach. [*176*] He should renounce profit and pleasure if they should conflict with religion, and even religion when it results in future unhappiness or arouses people's indignation. [*177*] He should not shake his arms and legs or let his eyes dart about or veer from the straight and narrow; he should not be wanton in his speech or malicious to others in mind or deed. [*178*] He should follow in the footsteps of his fathers and grandfathers; taking this path of good men, he will come to no harm.

[*179–80*] He should not engage in argument with his officiating priest, personal priest, or teacher, with his mother's brother, a guest, or anyone who lives in his house, with a child or anyone who is old or

ill or a physician, with a paternal relative, maternal relative, or in-law, with his mother, father, female relative, brother, son, wife, or daughter, or with the slaves. [*181*] Renouncing arguments with these people frees one from all evils; and conquered by these people, the householder in turn conquers all these worlds. [*182*] The teacher is master of Brahmā's world, the father the lord of (the world) of the Lord of Creatures, the guest is master of Indra's world, and the officiating priest (is master) of the world of the gods; [*183*] female relatives (are masters) in the world of the celestial nymphs, maternal relatives (in the world) of the All-gods, in-laws in the world of the waters, and the mother and the mother's brother (are masters) on earth. [*184*] A child or anyone who is old or ill should be known as the rulers of the ether, an eldest brother as equal to the father, a wife and son as one's very body, [*185*] one's own slaves as one's shadow, and one's daughter as the supreme object of pity. Therefore if one is abused by these people, one should always bear it without getting heated by the fever of resentment.

[*186*] Even if he is eligible to accept (gifts), he should avoid becoming addicted to that; for his brilliant energy that comes from the Veda is quickly extinguished through accepting (such gifts). [*187*] If he does not know the rules regarding the law for accepting material objects, a wise man should not accept (gifts), even if he is fainting with hunger. [*188*] An ignorant man who goes about accepting gold, land, a horse, a cow, food, clothing, sesame seeds, and clarified butter is reduced to ashes, as if he were wood. [*189*] Gold and food burn up his longevity, land and a cow his very body, a horse his eyesight, clothing his skin, clarified butter his brilliant energy, and sesame seeds his progeny. [*190*] But a twice-born man who neither generates inner heat nor recites (the Veda), and who loves to accept (gifts), sinks down together with that one (who gives), as if in water with a boat made of stone. [*191*] An ignorant man should therefore be afraid to accept gifts from just anyone; for an ignorant man is sunk even by a very small (gift), like a cow in mud.

[*192*] A man who knows the law should not offer even a little water to a twice-born man who acts like a cat, or to the evil man who acts like a heron, or to someone who does not know the Veda. [*193*] For wealth given to these three, even if it has been acquired through following the rules, becomes worthless in the hereafter for both the donor and the recipient. [*194*] Just as someone crossing over the water in a ship made of stone sinks, so the ignorant donor and the supplicant sink into the depths. [*195*] Anyone whose religion is just a flag, who is insatiably greedy, fraudulent, a hypocritical deceiver of people, violent, allying himself with anyone and everyone, should be recognized as a man who acts like a cat. [*196*] A twice-born man who

behaves like a heron is one who gazes downward, an exploiter, obsessed with the pursuit of his own self-interest, a hypocrite and falsely humble. [*197*] Priests who act like herons or show the distinctive signs of cats fall into the hell called 'Blind Darkness' through the evil effects of that past action.

[*198*] When he has committed evil, he should not undertake a vow (as a means of restoration) under the guise of religion, covering the evil with the vow and deceiving women and servants. [*199*] Such priests are despised, here on earth and after death, by those who expound the Veda, and (the credit for) a vow carried out as a fraud goes to the ogres. [*200*] An impostor who makes a living by dressing up in clothes that are the distinctive sign of someone else takes on himself the guilt of those whose signs he takes on and is born into the womb of an animal.

[*201*] He should never bathe in tanks of water that belong to someone else, for by so bathing he is smeared by a portion of the bad deeds of the one who made the tank. [*202*] He takes on himself a quarter of the guilt (of the owner) should he use, without permission, his carriage, bed, seat, well, garden, or house. [*203*] He should always take his bath in rivers, natural waterholes, ponds, lakes, hollows, or springs.

[*204*] An intelligent man should unfailingly attend to the restrictions but not regard the restraints as obligatory. A man who prefers the exclusive pursuit of the restraints, while leaving the restrictions undone, falls.

[*205*] A priest should never eat at a sacrifice offered by a priest who does not know the Veda by heart, by someone who conducts sacrifices for every sort of person, or by a woman or an impotent man. [*206*] Where an oblation is offered by such people there is bad luck for virtuous men; it goes against the grain of the gods, and therefore one should avoid it.

[*207*] He should never eat (the food) of those who are drunk, angry, or ill, nor (food) in which hair or bugs have fallen, or which has been intentionally touched by the foot; [*208*] nor (food) which has been looked at by an abortionist, or touched by a menstruating woman, or pecked at by a bird, or touched by a dog; [*209*] nor food sniffed by a cow, nor, most especially, food publicly advertised, nor the food of the hordes or of whores, or food that is disgusting to a learned man, [*210*] nor the food of a thief, a singer, a carpenter, a usurer, a man who has been initiated for a Soma sacrifice, a miser, or a man bound in chains; [*211*] nor of a man indicted, an impotent man, a woman who runs after men, or a deceiver, nor (food) that has been left out too long and soured, nor the leftovers of a servant; [*212*]

nor (the food) of a doctor, a hunter, a cruel man, one who eats leftovers, the food of a 'Dreaded' man or of a woman who has just given birth, the food left by someone who has got up to rinse his mouth, nor that of one still within the ten days (of pollution due to death); [*213*] nor food which is given disrespectfully or by a woman who has no man, meat without a sacrificial purpose, the food of an enemy or of the mayor of a town, nor the food of a man who has fallen, nor (food) which someone has sneezed on; [*214*] nor the food of a slanderer, a liar, or the seller of rituals, nor the food of a tumbler or a weaver, nor the food of an ingrate; [*215*] nor that of a blacksmith, a 'Hunter', a strolling actor, a goldsmith, a basket-weaver, or an arms-dealer; [*216*] nor that of a man who raises dogs, a bootlegger, a washerman, a dyer, a cruel man, or a man whose wife's lover lives in his house; [*217*] nor that of those who put up with such lovers, or who are dominated by their wives in all things, nor the food of those within the ten days (of pollution) due to death, nor unsatisfying food.

[*218*] The food of a king takes away brilliant energy; the food of a servant (takes away) the splendour of the Veda; the food of a goldsmith, longevity; that of a leather-worker, fame. [*219*] The food of a manual labourer kills off the progeny (of the man who eats it); that of a washerman (saps his) strength; the food of the hordes or of whores cuts him off from (all desirable) worlds. [*220*] The food of a doctor is pus, the food of a woman who runs after men is semen, the food of a money-lender is excrement, and the food of an arms-dealer is dirt. [*221*] Wise men say that the food of those others whose food is not to be eaten, enumerated (above) in order, is skin, bones, and hair. [*222*] Should a man unknowingly eat the food of one or another of these, a three-day fast (is required); should he eat it knowingly, or (should he eat) semen, urine, or excrement, he should undertake the 'Painful' (vow). [*223*] A learned twice-born man should not eat the cooked food of a servant who offers no ceremonies for the dead; when he is without means of subsistence he may accept from him only raw food sufficient for one night.

[*224*] The gods considered the case of the miser who knows the Veda by heart and that of the liberal money-lender and decided that the food of both was equal. [*225*] The Lord of Creatures came to them and said, 'Do not make equal what is unequal; that (food) of the liberal man is purified by his faith, while that of the other is destroyed by lack of faith.' [*226*] A man should always and tirelessly make sacrificial offerings and give rewards with faith; these acts of faith, carried out with properly earned wealth, become incorruptible. [*227*] He should always fulfil the duty of giving gifts involving offerings and rewards, placing them in the proper receptacles with a contented

disposition, to the best of his ability. [*228*] Whatever he may be asked for he should give without resentment; for the receptable for it that will appear will save him in all ways.

[*229*] A man who gives water obtains satiation; a giver of food, incorruptible happiness; a bestower of sesame seeds, desired progeny; and a giver of a lamp, excellent eyesight. [*230*] The giver of land himself gets land; the giver of gold, long life; one who gives a house, the finest dwellings; the giver of silver, superb beauty; [*231*] a man who gives clothing, the world of the moon; a man who gives a horse, the world of the Divine Horsemen; (a giver) of a draught ox (obtains) prosperous good fortune; a giver of a cow, the summit of the chestnut horse; [*232*] a man who bestows a carriage or a bed (obtains) a wife; the bestower of safety, sovereignty; the giver of grain, perpetual comfort; the giver of the Veda, identity with the power of ultimate reality. [*233*] The gift of the Veda is the best of all these gifts – water, food, cows, land, clothes, sesame seeds, gold, or melted butter.

[*234*] In whatever manner he presents whatever gift, he is honoured in return by obtaining that very gift in that very manner. [*235*] Both he who receives with honour and he who gives with honour go to heaven; in the opposite case, to hell.

[*236*] He should not go around astonishing people with his inner heat, and when he has offered a sacrifice he should not tell a lie. Even when he is provoked, he should not speak ill of priests; nor when he has given (something) should he brag about it. [*237*] By the telling of a lie, a sacrifice slips away; inner heat slips away because of astonishing (people), longevity by speaking ill of priests, and a gift because of bragging.

[*238*] Refraining from oppressing any living being, so that they might become his companions in the other world, he should gradually pile up religious merit just as ants pile up an ant hill. [*239*] For there (in that world) father, mother, wife, son, and relative do not endure as his companion; religion alone endures. [*240*] A living creature is born alone and alone he dies; he alone reaps the benefits of good deeds and the consequences of bad deeds. [*241*] Throwing off the dead body on to the ground, as if it were wood or clay, relatives avert their faces and depart; (but) religion follows after him. [*242*] Therefore he should constantly and gradually pile up religious merit so that it may become his companion (in the other world). For with religion as his companion he crosses over the darkness that is hard to cross. [*243*] Quickly (that companion) leads to the other world the man to whom religion is pre-eminent and whose offences have been annihilated by inner heat, glittering in his astral body.

[*244*] A man who wishes to raise up his family should always form

connections with people of the most superior sort, and reject the inferior types. [*245*] A priest who associates with the most superior sort and avoids inferiors attains pre-eminence, but by taking the opposite course (he attains) the status of a servant. [*246*] A resolute, gentle, controlled, non-violent man, who does not associate with people whose ways are cruel, wins heaven through his control and generosity when he behaves in that way.

[*247*] He may receive from anyone and everyone fuel-sticks, water, roots, fruit, food properly presented, and honey, as well as a sacrificial gift of safety. [*248*] The Lord of Creatures has deemed acceptable alms brought and presented even by a man who has committed bad deeds, provided (the alms) are not requested beforehand. [*249*] As for the man who disregards that (kind of alms), his ancestors do not eat for fifteen years, and Fire does not carry his offering to the gods. [*250*] He should not reject a bed, houses, sacrificial grass, perfumes, water, flowers, jewels, yogurt, grain, fish, milk, meat, or vegetables.

[*251*] He may accept (gifts) from anyone and everyone if he wants to rescue his gurus and dependants or to honour the gods or guests, but not to satisfy himself. [*252*] If his gurus have passed away, or if he is living in a house without them, and he seeks a way to make a living for himself, he should always accept (gifts only) from virtuous men.

[*253*] Among servants, one may eat the food of a sharecropper, a friend of the family, a cowherd, slave, barber, or someone who offers himself in service. [*254*] A man who offers himself in service should be honest about what he is, what he intends to do and how he might be of service. [*255*] A man who tells good men that he is someone who he is not is the worst kind of evil-doer in the world – a thief, a looter of his own self.

[*256*] The meaning of everything is controlled by speech. Speech is the root of everything. Everything is set into motion by speech. A man who robs that speech robs everything.

[*257*] When, in accordance with the rules, he has become free and clear of the debt he owes to the great sages, the ancestors, and the gods, he should dwell in a state of equanimity, turning over everything to his son. [*258*] Alone, he should meditate constantly in solitude on what is good for his soul; for by meditating when he is alone he ascends to the supreme good.

[*259*] The obligatory way of life for a priestly householder has thus been declared, and also the rule for following the vow of the Vedic graduate, which is auspicious and makes lucidity grow. [*260*] A priest who knows the teachings of the Veda and who leads this kind of life, always free from taints, will be glorified in the world of ultimate reality.

[4] 'Lawful' is *ṛta*, 'immortal' *amṛta*, 'mortal' *mṛta,* 'deadly' *pramṛta*, 'good and unlawful' *satyānṛta,* and 'the dog's way of life' is *śvavṛtti*. It is not immediately obvious why begging is 'mortal', but farming may be 'deadly' because it inadvertently causes the death of worms and insects in the course of ploughing.

[9] The domestic sacrificer who lives, economically, from day to day is here said to be living solely by means of the extended sacrifice consisting of the Veda (*brahmasattra*). This *brahmasattra* may serve as a title for that economic way of life itself.

[10] The sacrificial offerings (*iṣṭis*) apparently do not include the four-monthly (*cāturmāsya*) sacrifices. The lunar junctures are the *parvans* (see 4.113–14), and the sacrifices at the solstices are the *āgrāaṇas*, or first-fruits sacrifices.

[19] The treatises mentioned here, the *nigamas*, are treatises, written or oral, dealing with such supplementary branches of knowledge as grammar, logic, and commentaries on the Veda.

[22] The practice of offering 'interior sacrifices', by meditation rather than by the actual performance of the ritual, can be traced back to the Upaniṣads. Manu's verses on this subject are somewhat opaque, being wrenched out of their context of Upaniṣadic mysticism.

[23] This is a reference to the techniques of breath-suppression (*prāṇāyāma*) that are essential both to the practice of yoga and to the restraints and restorations described by Manu.

[26] The sacrifice at the end of the season is the four-monthly *cāturmāsya*, celebrated at the end of spring (mid-May), the rains (mid-September), and winter (mid-January), and the half-year sacrifices are the first-fruits sacrifices, (*āgrāyaṇas*) at the two solstices.

[30] People who act like cats and herons are particular varieties of hypocrites, described, and to some extent explained, in detail in 4.195–6.

[45] A commentator points out that when he eats he should wear more than one garment (that is, an upper garment in addition to a loincloth or dhoti), in order to cover the initiatory thread over his shoulder.

[69] The young sun is almost certainly the early morning sun, though some commentators suggest that it is the sun in the constellation of the virgin (*kanyā*, Virgo).

[79] The 'Tribals' are *pulkasas*, defined at 10.18 as born of a 'Hunter' father and servant mother; 'Those Who End Up at the Bottom' (*antyāvasāyins*) are said (at 10.39) to be born of a 'Fierce' Untouchable father and a 'Hunter' mother.

[81] The hell (*asaṃvṛta*) may also be 'Unbounded'.

[88] 'Darkness' is *tāmisra*, 'Blind Darkness' *andhatāmisra*, 'Belonging to the Great Spotted Deer' *mahāraurava*, 'Belonging to the Deer' *raurava*, 'the Thread of Time' *kālasūtra*, and 'the Great Hell' *mahānaraka*.

[89] 'Vivifying' is *saṃjīvana*, 'the Great Washing Away' *mahāvīci*, 'Burning' *tapana*, 'Excessively Burning' *sampratāpana*, 'Crushing' *saṃhāta*, 'Joined with the Raven' *sakākola*, 'Shut Up Like a Bud' *kuḍmala*, 'Stinking Earth' *pūtimṛttika*.

[90] 'Iron Spike' is *lohaśanku*, 'Dregs' *ṛjīṣa*, 'Impelling' *panthāna*, 'Thorny River' *śālmalīnadī*, 'Forest of Sword Leaves' *asipatravana*, and 'Tearing with Iron' *lohadāraka*.

[92] The moment of Brahmā (*brāhmamuhūrta*) is, according to the commentators, dawn, more precisely the last of the three watches of the night.

[95] Mid-July to mid-August is the month of Śrāvaṇa, and mid-August to mid-September is the month of Prauṣṭhapada.

[96] The moon is in Puṣya in the month of Pausa (mid-December to mid-January), on the day of the full moon; next comes the month of Magha, mid-January to mid-February.

[100] The portion composed in meters (*chandas*) is the collection (*saṃhitā*) of Vedic verses

(*mantras*). The part containing the explanation (*brahman*) is the *brāhmaṇa*.

[104] The fires are re-enlivened in the morning and evening for the daily fire sacrifice.

[110] The ceremony for one dead person is the *ekoddiṣṭa*, which is performed until the time of the ritual of 'Joining with those who share the same balls' (see 3.247). When the planet Rāhu swallows part of the sun or the moon, he brings about an eclipse.

[113] These days (new moon, full moon, and the eighth and fourteenth day of each lunar fortnight) are known as the (lunar) junctures, or days of the change of the moon (*parvans*).

[115] The group (*pankti*) might be a group of the animals just mentioned, or a group of educated people (the 'rows' that some are unfit to join).

[119] 'Eighth' (*aṣṭakā*) here designates not the eighth day of the lunar fortnight (as in 4.113–14) but a special ritual for the ancestors that is performed on the eighth day after the full moon in certain months, sometimes during winter and the cool season.

[123] The Wilderness Books (Āraṇyakas) are supplements to the Vedic collections, midway between the Brāhmaṇas and the Upaniṣads.

[125] The essences of the three Vedas are the syllable 'Om', the three ritual exclamations, and the verse to the sun-god (see 2.76–8).

[130] One commentator suggests that the tawny creature may be a brown cow; another that it may be either a brown cow or a Soma stalk (since both of these are connected with the Veda); another suggests a tawny man.

[150] The offerings to the sun-god (*sāvitras*) may be offerings accompanied by the Vedic verse to the sun-god (the *sāvitrī*). 'Eighth' (*aṣṭakā*) designates here, as in 4.119, a ritual for the ancestors, and 'after-eighths' (*anvaṣṭakā*) the ritual performed on the day after the *aṣṭakā*. The days of the junctures (*parvans*), defined in 4.113–14, are the new moon, full moon, and the eighth and fourteenth day of each lunar fortnight.

[156] An *alakṣaṇa* is literally a non-mark, the lack of a good distinguishing mark that bodes good fortune.

[192] The metaphors of the cat (*baiḍāla*) and the heron (*baka*) are glossed at 4.195–6.

[195] The hypocrisy of the cat is explained by a well-known story: A cat pretended to be an ascetic, standing in a yogic position all day outside the cave in which a family of mice lived. The mice trusted the cat, thinking that an ascetic must be a vegetarian. But as the days went by, and the numbers of the mice dwindled steadily, the mice realized that the cat was a false ascetic. This story, which is illustrated on a frieze at Mamallapuram from the seventh century A.D., is told in the *Tantropākhyāna*, tale #1.

[196] The hypocrisy of the heron may derive from observation of the heron's deceptive somnambulance or fastidiousness. In Indian beast fables, the heron often pretends to be asleep and thus lures to him the fish that he devours; 'heron' came to be a common term for a hypocrite. See *Pañcatantra* 1.6.

[203] The 'natural' waterholes are literally 'dug by the gods'.

[204] The verse turns on a distinction between restrictions (*yama*), more serious prohibitions, and restraints (*niyama*), minor observances. Here, as elsewhere, the fall may be from caste in this life or into hell in the next, or, most likely, both.

[212] 'Dreaded' (*ugra*) is the name of a mixed caste described at 10.9, 13, and 15; or it may simply refer to a man who is dreaded.

[213] The woman without a man is, according to the commentaries, a woman without a husband or sons.

[215] A 'Hunter' (*niṣāda*) is a member of a particular mixed caste, defined at 10.8 and 10.18.

[222] The 'Painful' vow (*kṛcchra*) is described at 11.212.

[227] The 'proper receptable' is a suitable recipient.

[229] Most of these statements depend upon the assumption of implicit connections (*bandhus*) between the object given and the abstract entity achieved by the gift. Some depend

upon verbal puns: thus silver (*rūpya*) leads to beauty (*rūpa*), and the gift of a horse (aśva) leads to the world of the Divine Horsemen (*aśvins*).

[231] The chestnut horse is the sun; the summit of the chestnut horse (*bradhnasya viṣṭapa*) is the highest world of the sun.

[234] The manner (*bhāva*) may be a frame of mind as well as a particular sort of gift. The commentators say he obtains the appropriate reward for that gift in the next life.

[253] 'Sharecropper' (*ārdhika*) is, literally, someone who works the land for half the crop.

[259] 'Lucidity' (*sattva*) is one of the three qualities (*guṇas*) of matter. The fact that Manu here refers to the householder explicitly as a priest confirms one's suspicion that *all* the rules in this chapter apply primarily to priests, and that, indeed, the term 'twice-born' generally refers only to the 'best of the twice-born' (*dvijottamas*), the priests.

CHAPTER 5

[*1*] When the sages had heard these duties of a Vedic graduate thus declared, they said this to the great-souled Bhrgu, who was born of fire: [*2*] 'My lord, how can Death have power over priests who know the teaching of the Veda and who fulfil their own particular duty as it has just been described?' [*3*] Bhrgu, the son of Manu, who was the soul of religion, replied to the great sages:

Listen to the fault through which Death tries to kill priests. [*4*] Through failure to study the Vedas, the neglect of proper conduct, inattentiveness to duties, and eating the wrong food, Death tries to kill priests.

[*5*] Garlic, scallions, onions, and mushrooms, and the things that grow from what is impure, are not to be eaten by twice-born men. [*6*] The red sap of trees, and any exudations from a cut (in a tree), the 'phlegmatic' fruit, and the first milk of a newly-calved cow – you should try not to eat these. [*7*] (And do not eat) a dish of rice with sesame seeds, or a spice cake made of flour, butter, and sugar, or a cake made of rice, milk and sugar, if these are prepared for no (religious) purpose; or meat that has not been consecrated; or food for the gods, or offerings; [*8*] or the milk of a cow within ten days of calving, or the milk of a camel or of any animal with a whole, solid hoof, or of a ewe, or of a cow in heat or a cow whose calf has been taken from her; [*9*] and avoid the milk of women, the milk of all wild animals in the wilderness except the buffalo, and all foods that have gone sour or fermented. [*10*] But among foods that have gone sour or fermented, yogurt can be eaten, and all foods made with yogurt, as well as whatever is extracted from auspicious flowers, roots, and fruits.

[*11*] Do not eat carnivorous birds or any birds that live in villages, or any whole-hoofed animals that have not been specially permitted; or little finches, [*12*] the sparrow, the aquatic bird, the goose, the waterbird, the village cock, the crane, the wildfowl, the moorhen, the parrot, and the starling; [*13*] birds that strike with their beaks, web-footed birds, the paddy-bird, birds that scratch with their toes, and birds that dive and eat fish; or meat from a butcher or dried meat; [*14*] or the heron or the crane, the raven or the wagtail; or (animals) that eat fish, or dung-heap pigs, or any fish. [*15*] Someone who eats the meat of an animal is called an eater of that animal's meat; someone who eats fish is an eater of every animal's meat; therefore you should avoid eating fish. [*16*] But sheat-fish and red fish may be eaten if they are used as offerings to the gods or the ancestors, and

‘striped’, ‘lion-faced’, and ‘scaly’ fish can always be eaten.

[*17*] You should not eat solitary or unknown wild animals or birds, nor any animals with five claws, not even those listed among the animals that may be eaten. [*18*] They say that, among the animals with five claws, the porcupine, hedgehog, iguana, rhinoceros, tortoise, and hare may be eaten, as well as animals with one row of teeth, except for the camel.

[*19*] Any twice-born person who knowingly eats mushrooms, a dung-heap pig, garlic, a village cock, onions, or scallions, will fall. [*20*] If he unknowingly eats (any of) these six, he should perform the ‘Heating’ vow or the ‘Ascetic’s Moon-course’ vow; and for (eating any of) the others, he should fast for a day. [*21*] A priest should perform the ‘Painful’ vow once a year in any case, in order to clean himself from anything (forbidden) that he has unknowingly eaten; but (he should do it) specially for (anything that he has eaten) knowingly.

[*22*] Wild animals and birds that are permitted (to be eaten) may be killed by priests for sacrifices and for the livelihood of dependants; for Agastya did this long ago. [*23*] Indeed, in the ancient sacrifices of the sages that were offered by priests and rulers, the sacrificial cakes were made of edible wild animals and birds. [*24*] Any food that is permitted (to be eaten) and is not despised may be eaten if oil is added to it, even if it has been kept overnight; and so can what is left over from an oblation. [*25*] But the twice-born may eat anything that is made of barley and wheat, or dishes cooked with milk, without adding oil, even when they have been standing for a long time.

[*26*] The list of what can be eaten and cannot be eaten by the twice-born has thus been declared, leaving nothing out. Now I will tell the rule for eating and not eating meat.

[*27*] You may eat meat that has been consecrated by the sprinkling of water, or when priests want to have it, or when you are properly engaged in a ritual, or when your breath of life is in danger. [*28*] The Lord of Creatures fashioned all this (universe) to feed the breath of life, and everything moving and stationary is the food of the breath of life. [*29*] Those that do not move are food for those that move, and those that have no fangs are food for those with fangs; those that have no hands are food for those with hands; and cowards are the food of the brave. [*30*] The eater who eats creatures with the breath of life who are to be eaten does nothing bad, even if he does it day after day; for the Ordainer himself created creatures with the breath of life, some to be eaten and some to be eaters. [*31*] ‘Eating meat is (right) for the sacrifice’: this is traditionally known as a rule of the gods. But doing it on occasions other than this is said to be the rule of ogres. [*32*] Someone who eats meat, after honouring the gods and ancestors,

when he has bought it, or killed it himself, or has been given it by someone else, does nothing bad.

[*33*] A twice-born person who knows the rules should not eat meat against the rules, even in extremity; for if he eats meat against the rules, after his death he will be helplessly eaten by them (that he ate). [*34*] The guilt of someone who kills wild animals to sell them for money is not so great, after his death, as that of someone who eats meat for no (religious) purpose. [*35*] But when a man who is properly engaged in a ritual does not eat meat, after his death he will become a sacrificial animal during twenty-one rebirths. [*36*] A priest should never eat sacrificial animals that have not been transformed by Vedic verses; but with the support of the obligatory rule, he may eat them when they have been transformed by Vedic verses. [*37*] If he has an addiction (to meat), let him make a sacrificial animal out of clarified butter or let him make a sacrificial animal out of flour; but he should never wish to kill a sacrificial animal for no (religious) purpose.

[*38*] As many hairs as there are on the body of the sacrificial animal that he kills for no (religious) purpose here on earth, so many times will he, after his death, suffer a violent death in birth after birth. [*39*] The Self-existent one himself created sacrificial animals for sacrifice; sacrifice is for the good of this whole (universe); and therefore killing in a sacrifice is not killing. [*40*] Herbs, sacrificial animals, trees, animals (other than sacrificial animals), and birds who have been killed for sacrifice win higher births again. [*41*] On the occasion of offering the honey-mixture (to a guest), at a sacrifice, and in rituals in which the ancestors are the deities, and only in these circumstances, should sacrificial animals suffer violence, but not on any other occasion; this is what Manu has said.

[*42*] A twice-born person who knows the true meaning of the Vedas and injures sacrificial animals for these (correct) purposes causes both himself and the animal to go to the highest level of existence. [*43*] A twice-born person who is self-possessed should never commit violence that is not sanctioned by the Veda, whether he is living in (his own) home, or with a guru, or in the wilderness, not even in extremity. [*44*] The violence to those that move and those that do not move which is sanctioned by the Veda and regulated by the official restraints – that is known as non-violence, for the law comes from the Veda.

[*45*] Whoever does violence to harmless creatures out of a wish for his own happiness does not increase his happiness anywhere, neither when he is alive nor when he is dead. [*46*] But if someone does not desire to inflict on creatures with the breath of life the sufferings of being tied up and slaughtered, but wishes to do what is best for everyone, he experiences pleasure without end. [*47*] A man who does no violence to anything obtains, effortlessly, what he thinks about,

what he does, and what he takes delight in. [*48*] You can never get meat without violence to creatures with the breath of life, and the killing of creatures with the breath of life does not get you to heaven; therefore you should not eat meat. [*49*] Anyone who looks carefully at the source of meat, and at the tying up and slaughter of embodied creatures, should turn back from eating any meat.

[*50*] A man who does not behave like the flesh-eating ghouls and does not eat meat becomes dear to people and is not tortured by diseases. [*51*] The one who gives permission, the one who butchers, the one who slaughters, and the one who buys and sells, the one who prepares it, the one who serves it, and the eater – they are killers. [*52*] No one is a greater wrong-doer than the person who, without reverence to the gods and the ancestors, wishes to make his flesh grow by the flesh of others. [*53*] The man who offers a horse-sacrifice every year for a hundred years, and the man who does not eat meat, the two of them reap the same fruit of good deeds. [*54*] A man who eats pure fruits and roots, or who eats what hermits eat, does not reap fruit (as great as that) of refraining from eating meat. [*55*] 'He whose *meat* in this world do I eat will in the other world *me eat*.' Wise men say that this is why meat is called meat. [*56*] There is nothing wrong in eating meat, nor in drinking wine, nor in sexual union, for this is how living beings engage in life, but disengagement yields great fruit.

[*57*] Now I will explain the cleansing for the dead and then the cleansing of things, in proper order for each of the four classes.

[*58*] When a child dies when he has just got his teeth, or after he has his teeth, or when he has had his first ceremonial haircut, all of his relatives become unclean, and also, it is said, on the occasion of a childbirth. [*59*] It is the rule that among co-feeding relatives the pollution caused by a corpse lasts for ten days, or until the bones are gathered, or three days, or one day. [*60*] But the relationship of co-feeding relatives stops with the seventh person (in the lineage, both past and future), and the relationship of co-watering relatives stops when no one knows the man's birth or name. [*61*] The very same pollution caused by a corpse that is the rule for co-feeding relatives should also apply in case of a birth, for people who aspire to perfect cleansing. [*62*] The pollution caused by a corpse affects all (co-feeding relatives), but (the pollution of) a birth affects the mother and father. (The pollution of) a birth is just for the mother, for the father becomes unpolluted by washing. [*63*] But when a man has shed his semen he is cleaned by washing; a sexual connection involving semen afflicts a man with inauspiciousness for three days.

[*64*] (Co-feeding relatives) who have touched a corpse become clean after a day and a night plus three periods of three days and nights, but co-watering relatives (become clean) after three days. [*65*]

And a pupil who performs the sacrifice to the ancestors for his dead guru also becomes clean after ten nights, just the same as those who carry away the corpse. [*66*] When there is a miscarriage, (a woman) becomes clean after the same number of nights as the months (since conception), and a menstruating woman becomes clean by bathing after the bleeding has stopped.

[*67*] The cleansing of (the relatives of dead) male children who have not had their ceremonial haircut is traditionally regarded as taking one night, but when the ceremonial haircut has taken place, a cleansing of three nights is recommended. [*68*] When a child dies before he is two years old, his maternal relatives should adorn him and deposit him outside (the village) on unpolluted ground, without gathering up the bones (afterwards). [*69*] No transformative ritual of fire should be performed for him, nor any rite of libation, but they should leave him in the wilderness like a piece of wood and fast for three days. [*70*] When a child dies before he is three years old, his maternal relatives should not perform any rite of libation for him, but if he has his teeth or has been ceremonially given a name, (such a libation) may be performed.

[*71*] When a fellow-student of the Veda has died, a fast of one day is traditionally prescribed; and cleansing is said to be achieved three nights after the birth of co-watering relatives. [*72*] The maternal relatives (of the family of the bridegroom) of women (who die) unmarried are purified after three days, and the 'umbilical' relatives are purified after the same period. [*73*] They should eat food with no alkalines or salt, and they should bathe (in rivers and ponds) for three days, abstain from eating meat, and lie on the ground, separately.

[*74*] The preceding set of rules for the pollution caused by a corpse has been prescribed (for those who live) near (the dead person); the following is the rule for relatives and in-laws who do not (live) near (the dead person).

[*75*] When someone who is staying in a distant country dies, a (relative) who hears of it within ten days (after the death) should remain polluted just for whatever remains of the ten-night period. [*76*] If ten days have passed, he should remain polluted for three nights; but if a whole year has passed, he is cleaned just by washing. [*77*] Someone who hears of the death of a relative or the birth of a son after ten days is cleaned by plunging into water with all his clothes on. [*78*] If a baby or a relative who is not a co-feeder dies in a foreign land, a person is cleaned immediately by plunging into water with all his clothes on.

[*79*] If another death or birth occurs within the ten-day period (of pollution), a priest remains polluted only for the exact period of the

ten days. [*80*] When a man’s teacher has died, they say the pollution lasts for three nights; and when his son or wife dies, it lasts for a day and a night; that is a fixed rule. [*81*] When a neighbouring priest who knows the Veda by heart dies, the pollution lasts for three nights; and upon the death of a maternal uncle, a pupil, or a maternal relative, it lasts for a night plus the preceding and following days. [*82*] On the death of the king of the country where a man is staying, (he is polluted) as long as the light (of the sun or the stars shines); but on the death of a priest who does not know the Veda by heart, or of a guru who can recite the Vedas and supplements to the Vedas, it lasts for a whole day. [*83*] A priest becomes clean ten days after (a death), a king after twelve days, a commoner after fifteen days, and a servant after a month. [*84*] One should not increase the days of inauspiciousness, nor interrupt the rites performed in fires; for not even an ‘umbilical’ relative remains polluted if he performs that ritual.

[*85*] If a man has touched a ‘Notorious by Day’ Untouchable, a menstruating woman, anyone who has fallen (from his caste), a woman who has just given birth, a corpse, or anyone who has touched any of these objects, he can be cleaned by a bath. [*86*] When a man sees (any of the above) polluting things after he has already become purified by rinsing out his mouth, he should always recite the Vedic verses to the sun, as much as he can, and the purifying Vedic verses, to the best of his ability. [*87*] If a priest touches a human bone that has fat on it, he is cleaned by a bath; if it has no fat, (he is cleaned) by rinsing out his mouth and (then) touching a cow or looking at the sun. [*88*] A man who has undertaken a vow should not pour the libation (for the dead) until he completes his vow; but when it is complete and he has performed the libation, he becomes clean after only three nights. [*89*] No ritual of libation should be poured for those who are born in vain or born from a wrong mixture of classes, or for those who live among renouncers or have taken their own lives; [*90*] nor for women who have joined a heretical sect, or who live on lust, or have abortions, or harm their husbands, or drink liquor. [*91*] A person who has made a vow and who then carries away his own dead teacher or instructor or father or mother or guru does not violate his vow. [*92*] A dead servant should be carried out through the southern gate of the town, but twice-born men through the western, northern, and eastern gates, as is appropriate.

[*93*] There is no fault of inauspiciousness in kings or in people who are engaged in vows or extended sacrifices; for (kings) are seated on the throne of Indra, and (the others) are in the realm of the Veda. [*94*] Instant purification is ordained for a king on his noble throne, and the reason is that he is seated there in order to protect his subjects. [*95*] (Instant purification is also ordained) for those who are killed in a riot

or a battle or by lightning or by the king, (or who have died) for the sake of a cow or a priest, and those whose (purification) a king desires. [*96*] A king has a body made of the eight Guardians of the World: Soma (the Moon), Fire, the Sun, Wind, Indra, the Lords of Wealth and Water (Kubera and Varuṇa), and Yama. [*97*] The king is inhabited by the Guardians of the World, and no pollution is ordained for him; for the pollution and purification of mortals are brought about and removed by the Guardians of the World. [*98*] When a man is killed by upraised weapons in battle, in fulfilment of the duty of a ruler, instantly he completes both a sacrifice and the period of pollution (caused by his death). This is a fixed rule. [*99*] A priest who has performed the rites (for the dead) is cleaned by touching water; a ruler (by touching) the animal that he rides and his weapons, a commoner (by touching) his whip or reins, and a servant (by touching) his stick.

[*100*] The pollution of co-feeding relatives has thus been told to you who are priests; now learn about the purification after the death of anyone who is not a co-feeding relative.

[*101*] When a priest has carried away, like a relative, a dead twice-born man who is not his co-feeding relative, or relatives of his mother, he becomes clean after three nights. [*102*] But if he eats their food, he becomes clean after ten days, and after only one day if he does not eat their food or live in their house. [*103*] When a man has voluntarily followed a corpse, whether of a relative or not, he is cleaned by bathing with all his clothes on, touching fire, and eating clarified butter. [*104*] A dead priest should not be carried away by a servant when men of his own class are standing by; for a burnt offering defiled by the touch of a servant would not get to heaven.

[*105*] Knowledge, inner heat, fire, (sacrificial) food, earth, thought, water, plastering (with cowdung), wind, rituals, the sun, and time are the agents of cleansing for embodied creatures. [*106*] Purification in matters of money is traditionally said to be the ultimate of all purifications; for a man who is unpolluted in money matters is truly unpolluted, but a man who gets his purification from earth and water is not unpolluted. [*107*] Learned men are cleaned by patience, and those who have done what should not be done (are cleaned) by generosity; people who have secretly done evil (are cleaned) by chanting (the Veda), and those who best know the Veda (are cleaned) by generating inner heat. [*108*] Whatever has to be cleaned is cleaned by means of earth and water; a river is cleaned by its current, a woman whose mind has been corrupted (is cleaned) by her menstrual blood, and priests (are cleaned) by renunciation. [*109*] The limbs are cleaned by water, and the mind is cleaned by truth; the soul of a living being is cleaned by learning and inner heat, and the intellect by

knowledge.

[*110*] The settled rule for the purification of the body has thus been explained to you; now learn the rule for the cleansing of various (inanimate) things.

[*111*] Wise men have said that metal articles, gems, and anything made of stone are to be cleaned with ashes, water, and earth. [*112*] A golden bowl that has no stains is cleaned just with water, as is whatever is born in water or made of stone, or silver that has not been worked. [*113*] Gold and silver were born of the union of water and fire, and so both of them are best washed by their own source. [*114*] Copper, iron, pewter, brass, tin, and lead must be purified as is appropriate (for each), with alkali, acids, and water.

[*115*] It is traditionally said that all liquids are cleaned by straining, solid things by sprinkling, and wooden things by planing. [*116*] In a sacrificial ritual, the sacrificial vessels are cleaned by rubbing them with your hand, and the wooden Soma cups and dippers by rinsing them with water. [*117*] The big pots and the ladles and spoons are cleaned with hot water, and so are the wooden sword, the winnowing-basket, and the cart, and the mortar and pestle. [*118*] Large quantities of grain and cloth should be purified by sprinkling them with water, and small quantities by rinsing them with water. [*119*] Leather and wicker are cleaned just like cloth, and vegetables, roots, and fruits just like grain. [*120*] Silk and wool are cleaned with saline soil, and cashmere blankets with (the puréed fruits of) the soap-berry tree; fine cloth with the fruits of the wood-apple tree, and linen with mustard. [*121*] A discerning person should clean conch-shell, horn, bone, and ivory just like linen, or with cow's urine and water.

[*122*] Grass, wood, and straw are cleaned by sprinkling them with water, a house by sweeping it and by smearing it (with cowdung), and anything made of earth by baking it again. [*123*] But if something made of earth has been touched by wine, urine, excrement, saliva, pus, or blood, it cannot be cleaned by baking it again. [*124*] There are five ways to clean land: sweep it, smear it (with cowdung), water it, dig it, and keep cows on it. [*125*] Food that birds have pecked, cows have sniffed, people have kicked or sneezed on, or hair or bugs have defiled is cleaned if earth is scattered on it. [*126*] As long as the smell and the stain remain on something that has been smeared with an impure substance, earth and water should be used for all the cleansing of objects.

[*127*] The gods made three purifiers for priests: what is not seen (to be impure), what is washed with water, or what is approved by the word (of a priest). [*128*] Water on the ground is clean if there is enough to slake the thirst of a cow, if nothing impure is in it, and if it

has (the right) smell, colour, and taste. [*129*] The hand of an artisan is always clean, as is what is laid out for sale and the food that a chaste student of the Veda obtains by begging; this is a fixed rule. [*130*] A woman's mouth is always unpolluted, as is a bird that knocks down a fruit; a calf is unpolluted while the milk is flowing, and a dog is unpolluted when it catches a wild animal. [*131*] Manu has said that the meat of an animal killed by dogs or killed by carnivores or by aliens such as 'Fierce' Untouchables is unpolluted.

[*132*] The orifices of the body above the navel are all pure, but those below are impure, as are the defilements that slip out of the body. [*133*] Flies, drops of water, a shadow, a cow, a horse, the rays of the sun, dust, earth, the wind, and fire are pure to touch, it should be noted. [*134*] Earth and water should be used as necessary to clean (the organs) that emit urine and excrement and also to clean (the following) twelve bodily defilements: [*135*] oil, semen, blood, bone marrow, urine, excrement, snot, ear-wax, phlegm, tears, the discharge from the eyes, and sweat; these are the twelve human defilements.

[*136*] A man who wants to become clean should use one piece of earth for his penis, three for his anus, ten for the one (left) hand, and seven for both hands. [*137*] This is how householders purify themselves; it should be doubled for chaste students of the Veda, tripled for forest-dwellers, and quadrupled for ascetics. [*138*] When someone has urinated or defecated, he should rinse his mouth and wash the orifices of his body; and he should also do this when he is about to recite the Veda and always when he is going to eat food. [*139*] A man who wants to purify his body should first rinse his mouth with water three times and then wipe his mouth twice; but a woman or a servant should just do each act once. [*140*] Servants who live properly should shave (their heads) once a month; they should purify themselves like commoners and eat the leftovers of the twice-born.

[*141*] Drops of water that fall from a man's mouth on to a part of his body do not make him a man defiled with food still on his mouth and hands, nor do hairs of his beard that get into his mouth or what gets stuck between his teeth. [*142*] If drops of water touch the feet of a person who is giving other people water to rinse their mouths, they should be regarded as the same as water on the ground and they do not make him unpurified. [*143*] If someone who has something in his hands is touched in any way by someone with food still on his mouth and hands, he becomes unpolluted if he rinses his mouth without putting that thing down. [*144*] Someone who has vomited or violently evacuated his bowels should bathe and then eat clarified butter; (if this happens) after he has eaten rice, he should just rinse his mouth, but a bath is traditionally prescribed for a man (who is thus afflicted)

after sexual union. [*145*] Even if a man is purified, he should rinse his mouth after he has slept and sneezed, eaten and spat, told lies, drunk water, or prepared to recite (the Veda).

[*146*] The entire set of rules for purification and the cleansing of objects for all classes has thus been described; now learn the duties of women.

[*147*] A girl, a young woman, or even an old woman should not do anything independently, even in (her own) house. [*148*] In childhood a woman should be under her father's control, in youth under her husband's, and when her husband is dead, under her sons'. She should not have independence. [*149*] A woman should not try to separate herself from her father, her husband, or her sons, for her separation from them would make both (her own and her husband's) families contemptible. [*150*] She should always be cheerful, and clever at household affairs; she should keep her utensils well polished and not have too free a hand in spending. [*151*] When her father, or her brother with her father's permission, gives her to someone, she should obey that man while he is alive and not violate her vow to him when he is dead.

[*152*] Benedictory verses are recited and a sacrifice to the Lord of Creatures is performed at weddings to make them auspicious, but it is the act of giving away (the bride) that makes (the groom) her master. [*153*] A husband who performs the transformative ritual (of marriage) with Vedic verses always makes his woman happy, both when she is in her fertile season and when she is not, both here on earth and in the world beyond. [*154*] A virtuous wife should constantly serve her husband like a god, even if he behaves badly, freely indulges his lust, and is devoid of any good qualities. [*155*] Apart (from their husbands), women cannot sacrifice or undertake a vow or fast; it is because a wife obeys her husband that she is exalted in heaven.

[*156*] A virtuous wife should never do anything displeasing to the husband who took her hand in marriage, when he is alive or dead, if she longs for her husband's world (after death). [*157*] When her husband is dead she may fast as much as she likes, (living) on auspicious flowers, roots, and fruits, but she should not even mention the name of another man. [*158*] She should be long-suffering until death, self-restrained, and chaste, striving (to fulfil) the unsurpassed duty of women who have one husband. [*159*] Many thousands of priests who were chaste from their youth have gone to heaven without begetting offspring to continue the family. [*160*] A virtuous wife who remains chaste when her husband has died goes to heaven just like those chaste men, even if she has no sons.

[*161*] But a woman who violates her (vow to her dead) husband

because she is greedy for progeny is the object of reproach here on earth and loses the world beyond. [*162*] No (legal) progeny are begotten here by another man or in another man's wife; nor is a second husband ever prescribed for virtuous women. [*163*] A woman who abandons her own inferior husband and lives with a superior man becomes an object of reproach in this world; she is said to be 'previously had by another man'. [*164*] A woman who is unfaithful to her husband is an object of reproach in this world; (then) she is reborn in the womb of a jackal and is tormented by the diseases born of her evil.

[*165*] The woman who is not unfaithful to her husband and who restrains her mind, speech, and body reaches her husband's worlds (after death), and good people call her a virtuous woman. [*166*] The woman who restrains her mind-and-heart, speech, and body through this behaviour wins the foremost renown here on earth and her husband's world in the hereafter. [*167*] A twice-born man who knows the law should burn a wife of the same class who behaves in this way and dies before him, using the (fire of the) daily fire sacrifice and the sacrificial vessels. [*168*] When he has given the (sacrificial) fires in the final ritual to the wife who has died before him, he may marry again and kindle the fires again. [*169*] He must never neglect the five (great) sacrifices, but should take a wife and live in his house, in accordance with this rule, for the second part of his life.

End of Chapter 5

[6] The 'phlegmatic' fruit is the *śelu* or Cordia Myxa, a plant that is regarded as being full of phlegm or mucus. The first milk of the cow is thick and full of colostrum.

[7] Meat is consecrated by sprinkling water on it and saying Vedic verses over it at the public (*śrauta*) sacrifices. The sacrificial foods should be offered first to the gods (and the priests), and only then may the remnants be eaten by other people.

[8] Animals with a whole, solid hoof (*ekaśapha*) are the class of equines.

[9] Buffalo were evidently still found in the wild at this period in India, though they were also already widely domesticated.

[11] The general prohibition against eating whole-hooved animals, which has already been stated in 5.8, admits at least one important exception: the horse that is slaughtered and eaten in the horse-sacrifice. The little finch is the *ṭiṭṭibha* (Parra Jancana).

[12] The sparrow is the *kalavinka*, the aquatic bird is the *plava*, the goose is the *haṃsa*, the waterbird is the *cakravaka*, the crane is the *sārasa*, the wildfowl the *rajjuvāla*, the moorhen the *dātyūha*, and the starling the *sārika*.

[14] The heron is the *baka*, the crane the *balākā*, the raven the *kākola*, and the wagtail the *khañjarīṭaka*.

[15] The fish, being both a scavenger and a cannibal (an animal that eats others of its own species), contains within it all kinds of meat.

[16] These fish are called *pāṭhīna* (Silurus Pelorius or Boalis), *rohita* (Cyprinus Rohitaka), *rājīva* ('striped'), siṃhatuṇḍa ('lion-faced'), and *saśalka* ('scaly') in Sanskrit. It is hard, if not impossible, to identify some of the precise species.

[18] It is hard to distinguish the hedgehog and porcupine precisely (though it is evident that they are not exactly the same as the European species), but their names are evocative of prickles: the first is literally a 'dog-piercer' (*śvāvidha*), and the second 'arrowish' (*śālyaka*). The animals with one row of teeth are equines.

[19] Here, as elsewhere, the 'fall' might be from caste, in this world, or into hell, in the next.

[20] The 'Heating' vow (*sāntapana*), the 'Ascetic's Moon-course' vow (*yaticāndrāyaṇa*), and various forms of the 'Painful' vow are described in detail at 11.213, 11.219, 11.212.

[22] One commentator on this verse says Agastya did this to feed his children. Agastya is also said to have easily digested several demons and the entire ocean in order to help the gods, who were in a sense his dependants at that time (*Mahābhārata* 3.97, 100–103).

[54] The commentators explain that a person should merely refrain from eating the meat specifically prohibited by the teachings. The verse implies that it is better to eat all sorts of foods except meat (or except certain meats) than to subsist on hermit-food alone.

[55] This translation of this much-quoted verse is based on that of Charles Lanman, who attempted to capture the Sanskrit pun: meat is called *māṃsa* because he (*sa*) eats me (*mām*) in the other world if I eat him now. A similar pun is made in Vedantic texts on the metaphor for the soul, the swan (*haṇsa*), said to express the identity of the individual soul (*ātman*) and the world-soul (*brahman*): 'I am he' (*ahaṃ sa*).

[56] The implication is that these activities are permitted under the specified circumstances, but that, even then, it is better to refrain from them and, perhaps, to refrain from engagement in life in general (*pravṛtti*), which is here, as often, explicitly contrasted with a word that means disengagement (*nivṛtti*) from life in general.

[59] 'Co-feeding' relatives are *sapiṇḍas*. The ancestors are calculated for seven generations into the past and the future. The term thus includes a man's father, father's father, father's grandfather; mother, mother's father, mother's grandfather; son, son's son, son's grandson; daughter, daughter's son, daughter's grandson. It also includes the same group starting from the brothers and sisters of both parents, and several others. The four rules for the duration of pollution may apply to four different sorts of mourners, or they may depend upon the status or age of the dead person, or even upon the four specific ages of the dead child designated in the previous verse.

[60] The 'co-watering' relatives are the *samānodakas*, literally 'people who offer the same libations of water', generally said to include people of six or seven generations beyond the point where the relationship of co-feeding relatives (*sapiṇḍas*) ceases.

[62] This verse seems to contradict the previous verse. Several commentators attempt to resolve the dilemma by condensing the two verses into one. Others suggest that 5.62 offers alternative views, which seems more likely.

[63] The commentators suggest various ways of resolving the apparent contradiction in these two lines, such as specifying different women for the two different instances. One might also suggest (though in flagrant contradiction of the commentators, who gloss the first line as indicating that the man is begetting a child) that the first line does not specify the presence of any woman at all, for Manu disapproves of men who shed their semen all by themselves (as in the rules for the man who breaks his vow by shedding his semen, 11.119–24).

[64] Some commentators suggest that the first half of this rule applies to priests who carry dead bodies to the cremation grounds for money; others that it applies to anyone who touches or carries a corpse, 'for love or for money', as Bühler puts it.

[65] The corpse is carried out of the village and into the cremation grounds.

[68] The unpolluted ground is probably a place where there are no other corpses.

[72] 'Umbilical' relatives are literally those '(born) of the same navel' (*sanābhi*).

[74] Here the contrasting terms are relatives (*bāndhavas*, more particularly, maternal

relatives) and in-laws (*sambandhins*, affinal relatives, relatives by marriage).

[78] The commentaries suggest that the relative who is not a co-feeder (*pṛthakpiṇḍa*) may be a co-waterer (*samānodaka*).

[82] To make better sense of this verse, some commentators suggest that the last man mentioned does *not* know the Vedas and supplements to the Vedas, or that he is *not* one's guru, both of which are possible but rather awkward readings.

[84] The rites performed in fires are the daily fire sacrifices (*agnihotras*).

[85] The Untouchable in this verse is a *divākīrti* ('notorious by day'), a term for a barber or for a particular group of Untouchable leatherworkers also called 'Fierce' Untouchables (*caṇḍālas*).

[86] The Vedic verses to the sun (Sūrya) are ṛg *Veda* 1.50.1ff; the purifying Vedic verses are the verses to Soma in the ninth book of the ṛg *Veda*. See 11.250–58.

[88] The vow may be the vow of chastity of a student, or some other vow. In the former case, some commentators make an exception and allow him to pour the libation for one or both parents.

[89] 'Born in vain' probably means that they have never become real people through the transformative rituals or that they have violated the law that is their *raison d'être*.

[90] The women who live on lust may be prostitutes or merely promiscuous women.

[92] That is, a commoner through the western gate, a ruler through the northern, and a priest through the eastern, according to the commentators.

[93] 'Are in the realm of the Veda' (*brahmabhūta*) might also be translated 'have merged with ultimate reality' or 'have become priests' or 'have become as pure as priests', as some commentaries suggest.

[95] The people whom the king needs to keep purified would include servants or ministers whom he depends upon to act for him.

[98] A man's death in battle (or, according to some, his subsequent death from wounds received in battle) is regarded as a sacrifice in which he is the victim, and gives him the same religious merit that he would have acquired from performing an actual sacrifice. As a result, his death does not make any of his relatives impure.

[102] The rule applies to someone who eats the food of those relatives who have been polluted by death.

[104] The 'burnt-offering' may refer, in a real instance or in a simile, to an actual oblation offered in the funeral sacrifice, or, in a euphemism, to the corpse of the dead man regarded as such an offering.

[112] Things born in water are shells and so forth.

[113] The commentaries cite Vedic verses describing the birth of gold from the sexual union of the god of fire (Agni) and the goddess of water (Varuṇāṇī). Fire and water are therefore the source (literally, the womb) of gold and silver.

[115] Straining is best done with two blades of sacrificial grass (*kuśa*).

[116] The wooden cups are the *cāmasa* cups.

[117] The big pots are the *cāru* pots used for the *cāru* oblations of rice, butter, and milk.

[120] 'Cashmere blankets' are *kutapas*, special blankets from Nepal made of goat's hair. The soap-berry is the *ariṣṭaka* tree (Sapindus Detergens Roxb.). The wood-apple tree is the *bilva* or Bel (Aegle Marmelos).

[124] Some commentaries say that the cows need remain only for a day and a night.

[125] *Avadhūta* ('kicked or sneezed on') may mean kicked or blown upon or defiled by something shaken on to it or touched by a broom or some other object. 'Hair or bugs' may also mean 'hair-bugs', i.e. lice.

[131] The word here translated as 'alien' is *dasyu*, a generic term for a group of low castes defined at 10.45. The *dasyu* was in Vedic times a non-Aryan or a barbarian, often a demon; later the *dasyu* was a slave, and still later a robber or man fallen from caste.

The word came to be used as a general term of opprobrium, denoting (according to the commentators on 8.66) a murderer, a bad-tempered man, or a low-caste man. In Manu, it usually designates a person of no caste at all, somehow outside of the entire caste system. The rationale for the purity of meat procured from such paradigmatically impure sources is too complex to contemplate here.

[135] Several commentaries gloss 'marrow' as the fatty substance in the middle of the brain, but this does not seem to be something that one would encounter with any significant frequency.

[161] This verse and the next argue against the custom of appointing a woman to bear a son to another man after her husband's death, a custom which Manu discusses with considerable ambivalence in 9.56–70.

[163] The words for inferior and superior (*apakṛṣṭa* and *utkṛṣṭa*) probably refer to caste birth but may refer more generally to the qualities of the man himself.

CHAPTER 6

[*1*] After he has lived in the householder's stage of life in accordance with the rules in this way, a twice-born Vedic graduate should live in the forest, properly restrained and with his sensory powers conquered. [*2*] But when a householder sees that he is wrinkled and grey, and (when he sees) the children of his children, then he should take himself to the wilderness. [*3*] Renouncing all food cultivated in the village and all possessions, he should hand his wife over to his sons and go to the forest – or take her along. [*4*] Taking with him his sacrificial fire and the fire-implements for the domestic (sacrifice), he should go out from the village to the wilderness and live (there) with his sensory powers restrained.

[*5*] He should offer the (five) great sacrifices with various sorts of the pure food of hermits, or with vegetables, roots, and fruit, ritually prepared. [*6*] He should wear an animal skin or bark or rags; he should bathe in the evening and in the morning; he should always keep his hair matted and his beard, body hair, and nails (uncut). [*7*] He should give as a propitiatory offering and as alms some of whatever he has to eat, to the best of his ability; with alms consisting of water, roots, and fruits he should honour the people who come to his hermitage. [*8*] Constantly devoting himself to the private recitation of the Veda, he should be controlled, friendly, and mentally composed; he should always be a giver and a non-taker, compassionate to all living beings.

[*9*] He should make the oblation of the daily fire sacrifice in the three sacrificial fires, carefully and according to the rules, not neglecting the junctures of the new moon and the full moon. [*10*] He should perform the sacrifice to the lunar constellations, the sacrifice of the first-fruits, the four-monthly sacrifices, and the sacrifices of the winter and summer solstices, in the proper order. [*11*] With the pure food of hermits, harvested in spring or autumn, that he himself has collected, he should make an offering of sacrificial cakes and consecrated pots of porridge, separately and according to the rules.

[*12*] And when he has made an oblation to the deities consisting of an offering of the purest things of the forest, he should make use of the remainder for himself, together with salt that he himself has made. [*13*] He should eat vegetables that grow on land or in water, flowers, roots, and fruits, the products of pure trees, and oils from fruits. [*14*] He should not eat honey, meat, mushrooms, or vegetables that grow in the ground; nor the plants known as 'Grass-of-the-Earth', horseradish, or the 'phlegmatic' fruit. [*15*] In September or October he should throw away the hermits' food that he has previously collected,

together with his worn-out clothing and his vegetables, roots, and fruits. [*16*] He should not eat anything grown from land tilled with a plough, even if someone has thrown it out, nor roots and fruits grown in a village, even if he is in distress (from hunger). [*17*] He should eat food cooked by fire or ripened by time, and he may grind it with a stone or use his teeth for a mortar.

[*18*] He may wash out (his food dish) immediately (after his daily meal) or collect enough food for a month, or for six months, or for a year. [*19*] When he has gathered as much food as he can, he may eat it at night or in the daytime, at every fourth mealtime or even at every eighth mealtime. [*20*] Or he may live by the 'Moon-course' vow, (diminishing his food intake every day) in the bright (half of the month) and (increasing it) in the dark (half); or he may eat thin boiled barley-gruel once on each of the two days at the end of each lunar fortnight. [*21*] Or he may follow the doctrine of the 'Diggers' and subsist constantly on nothing but flowers, roots, and fruits that have been ripened by time and have fallen by themselves.

[*22*] He may roll about on the ground all day or stand on tiptoe, and he may relax by standing and sitting, and go to the water (to wash) at the time of the three Soma pressings. [*23*] He should heat himself with the five fires in summer, live under the open sky in the monsoon, and wear wet clothes in winter, gradually increasing his inner heat. [*24*] When he washes at the time of the three Soma pressings he should offer libations of water to the ancestors and to the gods, and he should dry up his own body by generating more and more intense inner heat. [*25*] When he has transferred his three sacrificial fires within himself in accordance with the rules, he should become a hermit with no fire and no home, eating only roots and fruits, [*26*] making no effort to get the things that give happiness, chaste, sleeping on the bare ground, owning no shelter, taking the roots of trees for his home.

[*27*] He should get food for bare subsistence by begging from priests who are ascetics themselves, from householders, and from other twice-born forest-dwellers. [*28*] Or a man who lives in the forest may get (food) from a village, receiving it in the hollow of a leaf or in his hand or in a broken clay dish, and eat eight mouthfuls of it. [*29*] To perfect himself, a priest who lives in the forest must follow these and other preparations for consecration, as well as the various revealed canonical texts of the Upaniṣads, [*30*] and those that sages and priestly householders have followed, to increase learning and inner heat and to clean the body.

[*31*] Or he should set out in a north-easterly direction and walk straight forward, diligently engaged in eating nothing but water and air, until his body collapses. [*32*] A priest who has abandoned his

body by any one of those practices of the great sages, without sorrow or fear, is exalted in the world of ultimate reality.

[*33*] And when he has spent the third part of his lifespan in the forests in this way, he may abandon all attachments and wander as an ascetic for the fourth part of his lifespan. [*34*] A man who has gone from one stage of life to another, made the offerings into the fire, conquered his sensory powers, exhausted himself by giving alms and propitiatory offerings, and then lived as a wandering ascetic – when he has died, he thrives. [*35*] When a man has paid his three debts, he may set his mind-and-heart on Freedom; but if he seeks Freedom when he has not paid the debts, he sinks down. [*36*] When a man has studied the Veda in accordance with the rules, and begotten sons in accordance with his duty, and sacrificed with sacrifices according to his ability, he may set his mind-and-heart on Freedom. [*37*] But if a twice-born man seeks Freedom when he has not studied the Vedas, and has not begotten progeny, and has not sacrificed with sacrifices, he sinks down. [*38*] When he has performed the sacrifice to the Lord of Creatures, in which he gives away all his possessions as the sacrificial gift, and he has transferred his (three sacrificial) fires within himself, a priest may leave his house to wander as an ascetic. [*39*] When a man who expounds the Veda promises safety to all living beings and leaves his house to wander as an ascetic, he wins worlds made of brilliant energy. [*40*] If a twice-born man has not caused even an atom of danger to any living creatures, when he has been freed from his body there will be no danger to him from anything at all. [*41*] When he has departed from his house, taking with him the instruments of purification, he should wander as an ascetic hermit, indifferent to the desirable pleasures that may come his way.

[*42*] He should always go all alone, with no companion, to achieve success; realizing that success is for the man who is alone, he neither deserts nor is deserted. [*43*] The hermit should have no fire and no home, but should go to a village to get food, silent, indifferent, unwavering and deep in concentration. [*44*] A skull-bowl, the roots of trees, poor clothing, no companionship, and equanimity to everything – this is the distinguishing mark of one who is Freed. [*45*] He should not welcome dying, nor should he welcome living, but wait for the right time as a servant waits for orders. [*46*] He should set down his foot on a place purified by his gaze, drink water purified by a straining cloth, speak words purified by truth, and act in ways purified by mind-and-heart. [*47*] He should endure hard words and never despise anyone, nor become anyone's enemy for the sake of this body. [*48*] He should not respond with anger against someone who is angry, but speak a blessing when he is threatened; nor should he speak untruthful words shed at the seven gates. [*49*] He should live here on

earth seated in ecstatic contemplation of the soul, indifferent, without any carnal desires, with the soul as his only companion and happiness as his goal.

[*50*] He should never try to obtain alms by (interpreting) portents and omens, nor by skill in astrology or palmistry, nor by counselling or disputation. [*51*] He should not go near a house swarming with ascetics, priests, birds, dogs, or other beggars. [*52*] With his hair, nails, and beard trimmed, carrying a bowl, a staff, and a water pot, he should wander constantly, self-controlled and without oppressing any living being. [*53*] His bowls should not be cracked or made of metal, and they should be purified with water in the traditional way, just like the wooden Soma cups at the sacrifice. [*54*] Manu the son of the Self-existent has said that a gourd or bowl made of wood, clay, or cane is the bowl for an ascetic.

[*55*] He should go begging once a day and not be eager to get a great quantity, for an ascetic who is addicted to food becomes attached to sensory objects, too. [*56*] When there is no more smoke, when the pestle is at rest, when the embers have gone out, when the people have eaten, when the dishes have been removed, then the ascetic should always go to beg. [*57*] He should not be sad when he does not get anything nor delighted when he gets something, but take only what will daily sustain his vital breath, transcending any attachment to material things. [*58*] He should always have disgust for things got by grovelling, for even a Freed ascetic is bound by things got by grovelling. [*59*] If his sensory powers are being seduced by sensory objects he should turn them back by eating little food and by standing and sitting in solitude. [*60*] By obstructing his sensory powers, destroying passion and hatred, and doing no violence to living beings he becomes fit for immortality.

[*61*] He should think about where men go as a result of the faults of the effects of their past actions and about how they fall into hell and are tortured in the house of Yama; [*62*] and about how they are separated from the people they like and united with the people they dislike, and are overcome by old age and tormented by diseases; [*63*] and about how the individual soul goes out of this body and is born again as an embryo, meandering through thousands of millions of wombs: [*64*] and about the unhappiness that embodied creatures experience as a result of irreligion and the incorruptible happiness that results from achieving the goal of religion. [*65*] Through yoga he should meditate on the subtleness of the supreme Soul and its presence in the highest and lowest bodies.

[*66*] He should fulfil his own duty, with equanimity to all living beings, in whatever stage of life he may choose, even if he is flawed (in that duty); the (mere outward) sign is not (sufficient) fulfilment of

one's duty. [67] Even though the fruit of the clearing-nut tree makes water clear, the water does not become clear by merely mentioning the (fruit's) name. [68] To protect living creatures, he should inspect the ground constantly as he walks, by night or day, because of the risk of grievous bodily harm. [69] And to cleanse himself of (the deaths of) whatever living creature he unknowingly injures, by day or night, the ascetic should bathe and suppress his breath six times. [70] Suppressing the breath three times, in accordance with the rules and supplemented by the recitation of the syllable 'Om' and the three Vedic exclamations, should be regarded as a priest's supreme generation of inner heat. [71] For just as the defiling dirt of metal ores is burnt away in the blast of a furnace, so the faults of the sensory powers are burnt away by suppressing the breath. [72] Faults should be burnt away by suppressing the breath, guilt by concentrated attention, addictions by resistance, and unmastered qualities by meditation.

[73] Through the practice of meditation he should realize the destination of the individual soul through higher and lower living beings, which is hard for people with imperfect souls to understand. [74] The man who has the ability to see correctly is not bound by the effects of his past actions, but the man who lacks this vision is caught up in the cycle of transmigration. [75] Through non-violence, lack of attachment of the sensory powers, Vedic rituals, and intense inner heat people achieve that place here on earth.

[76–7] He should abandon this foul-smelling, tormented, impermanent dwelling-place of living beings, filled with urine and excrement, pervaded by old age and sorrow, infested by illness, and polluted by passion, with bones for beams, sinews for cords, flesh and blood for plaster, and skin for the roof. [78] When he abandons this body, as a tree abandons the bank of a river or a bird abandons a tree, he is freed from a painful shark. [79] Casting the credit for his good deeds on to the people he likes and the discredit for his bad deeds on to those he dislikes, he reaches the eternal ultimate reality through the practice of meditation. [80] When through his natural emotion he becomes impervious to all natural emotions, then he wins lasting happiness here on earth and after death. [81] When he has gradually abandoned all attachments in this way and is freed from all the pairs, he is absorbed right into the ultimate reality.

[82] The entire subject of this discussion involves meditation, for no one who does not know about the soul enjoys the fruits of his rituals. [83] He should constantly chant the Veda about the sacrifice, the one about the gods, and the one about the soul, which is set down at the end of the Veda. [84] That is the refuge of those who do not know and of those who do know, of those who want to get to heaven

and of those who long for the infinite. [*85*] A twice-born man who wanders as an ascetic after engaging in this sequence shakes off evil here on earth and reaches the highest ultimate reality.

[*86*] The duty of self-controlled ascetics has thus been taught to you; now learn about the activities that renouncers of the Veda should engage in.

[*87*] The chaste student of the Veda, the householder, the forest-dweller, and the ascetic – these four separate stages of life originate in the householder. [*88*] Any or all of these (stages of life), adopted in succession by a priest who does what has just been explained in accordance with the teaching, lead him to the highest level of existence. [*89*] But the householder is said to be the best of all of them, according to the rule of the revealed canon of the Veda, for he supports the other three. [*90*] Just as all rivers and streams culminate in the ocean, even so people in all stages of life culminate in the householder.

[*91*] Twice-born men in all four stages of life must constantly and carefully fulfil their ten-point duty. [*92*] The ten points of duty are patience, forgiveness, self-control, not stealing, purification, mastery of the sensory powers, wisdom, learning, truth, and lack of anger. [*93*] Those priests who study the ten points of duty carefully and, after they have learnt it, follow it, progress to the highest level of existence. [*94*] When a twice-born man has fulfilled his ten-point duty with concentration, learned the Vedānta according to the rules, and paid his (three) debts, he may become a renouncer.

[*95*] When he has renounced all innate activities and dispelled the faults of the effects of his past actions, when he has restrained himself and studied the Veda, he may live happily under the control of his sons. [*96*] When he has renounced actions in this way and regards as paramount what he himself should do, when he is without longing and has struck down his guilt by means of his renunciation, he attains the highest level of existence.

[*97*] The meritorious four-fold duty of the priest, which yields incorruptible fruits after death, has thus been explained to you; now learn the duties of kings.

End of Chapter 6

[2] Sons, rather than daughters, are almost certainly meant by 'children'.

[3] One commentator suggests that he should take her along if she wants to go; another suggests that he take her along if she is old, but leave her behind if she is young.

[4] The term *agnihotra* here may denote the sacrificial fire or the materials for the daily fire sacrifice.

[10] Other readings of this verse specify two other sacrifices, modified versions of the new-moon and full-moon sacrifices.

[14] The three last plants are the *bhūtṛṇa* (Andropogon Schoenanthus), the *śigruka* (Moringa Pterygosperma), and the *śleṣmātaka* (Cordia Myxa).

[15] The month specified is Aśvina, mid-September to mid-October.

[18] The first instance indicates that he may collect in his, dish only enough for one meal.

[19] The commentators assume that there are two normal mealtimes each day, and that the four alternatives in this verse are therefore to eat once a day, once a night, every other day or night, or every fourth day or night.

[21] The 'Diggers' (*vaikhānasas*, presumably digging for roots) are famous householder hermits.

[22] He bathes at the time of the three *savanas*, Soma pressings, at sunrise, noon, and sunset.

[23] The asceticism of the five fires consists in building four fires around him on four sides, with the sun above as the fifth. He increases his inner heat not only in the sense of undertaking increasingly severe measures but in the sense of amassing a store of merit and accumulating inner heat.

[29] The commentaries state that the preparations for consecration (*dīkṣās*) are the restraints (*niyamas*).

[32] Some commentators suggest that 'those practices' are known from other texts and include drowning oneself, jumping off a cliff, burning oneself to death, and starving to death; others suggest that they are the methods enumerated in the present text, beginning with the asceticism of the five fires (in 6.23).

[34] The commentators suggest several ways in which he thrives – he has great powers, or bliss, or Freedom.

[35] 4.257 lists those to whom the debts are owed: the great sages, the ancestors, and the gods. Here, in 6.35–7, we learn what is owed to each of them, respectively. 'Sinks down' probably means falls into hell, rather than falls to a lower caste.

[45] An alternative interpretation of *nirdeṣa* is 'pay-day' rather than 'orders'.

[46] For 'purified by his gaze', a commentator suggests that he should look to make sure there is no living creature where he is about to step.

[48] The commentators are full of helpful suggestions about these gates: the five senses, plus mind and the sense of 'I' or plus mind and intellect; the seven vital breaths in the head; or the seven permutations of the combinations of the three human goals, religion (*dharma*), profit (*artha*), and pleasure (*kāma*). The verb ('shed', *avakīrṇa*) is the same as the term for someone who has violated his vow by 'shedding' his semen. The metaphor remains opaque, but from the context it seems to refer to promiscuous worldly chatter.

[66] The meaning of this rather obscure verse seems to be that, on the one hand, even if one is flawed (perhaps by the lack of the external signs of a stage of life, such as the staff of the ascetic, as the commentators suggest), one can still fulfil the duty; and that, on the other hand, it is not sufficient merely to carry the external signs of a stage of life (such as the staff of the ascetic) if one does not actually fulfil the duty.

[67] The fruit of the clearing-nut tree is the *kataka* or Strychnos Potatorum, which is rubbed on the insides of water jars to precipitate the particles of dirt in the water.

[70] For the three Vedic exclamations, see 2.76.

[72] The unmastered (*anīśvara*) qualities (*guṇas*) are those that are not independent, or that are not associated with the Lord, or not virtuous.

[75] 'That place' is the world of ultimate reality, or the condition of union with ultimate reality.

[76–7] 'Dwelling-place of living beings' (*bhūtavāsa*) may also be translated 'dwelling-place made of the elements'. 'Polluted by passion' (*rajasvala*) may also be translated 'dominated by the quality of energy' or (in the feminine) 'menstruating'. For the metaphor of the body as house, see *Maitri Upaniḥad* 3.4 and *Mahābhārata* 12.316.42–3.

[78] The ‘shark’ (Sanskrit *graha*) is literally a ‘grabber’, a name for any rapacious marine animal, such as a crocodile or shark or sea-serpent. The commentators gloss the first two metaphors in various ways, generally arguing for a contrast between the involuntary separation of the tree from the bank and the voluntary separation of the bird from the tree.

[81] The pairs are the dualisms of sensory perceptions, such as pain and pleasure, heat and cold, hunger and satiety, honour and dishonour.

[82] ‘The subject of this discussion’ (*etad abhiśabditam*) may refer to the one preceding verse, to all the verses in this text about the stages of life, or indeed to anything that has been said anywhere on this subject.

[83] The Veda of the sacrifice might be the *Yajur Veda* and/or the *Sāma Veda*, or the Brāhmaṇas, or the part of the Veda known as the *karmakaṇḍa*. The Veda about the gods is the *ṛg Veda*. The ‘end of the Veda’, or Vedānta, probably refers to the Upaniṣads.

[86] This is a troubling verse. The commentators take pains to specify that ‘renouncers of the Veda’ (*vedasannyāsikas*) no longer perform the Vedic sacrifices but continue to recite the Veda, which is the ‘activity they should engage in’ (*karmayoga*, which might also refer to the performance of Vedic rituals!). We might also translate ‘of the Vedas’ more loosely to mean ‘Vedic’, so that the compound would designate not people who renounce the Veda but renouncers who remain Vedic in their allegiance. Most commentators suggest that these are priests who have renounced worldly life but continue to live in houses; some say that they are householders, others that they are ascetics, while still others identify them with the householders described at 4.22–4. In any case, only in 6.94–6 is such an ascetic described; the intervening verses seem to suggest reasons why one should *not* take this path but should, rather, remain a non-renouncing householder.

[95] He may renounce all innate activities (*karmans*) or all rituals.

[97] Duty (*dharma*) is four-fold here in that it deals with the four stages of life (or *āśramas*). (It is also four-fold in dealing with the four classes, or *varṇas*.)

CHAPTER 7

[*1*] I will explain the duties of kings, how a king should behave, how he came to exist, and how (he may have) complete success. [*2*] A ruler who has undergone his transformative Vedic ritual in accordance with the rules should protect this entire (realm) properly. [*3*] For when this world was without a king and people ran about in all directions out of fear, the Lord emitted a king in order to guard this entire (realm), [*4*] taking lasting elements from Indra, the Wind, Yama, the Sun, Fire, Varuṇa, the Moon, and (Kubera) the Lord of Wealth. [*5*] Because a king is made from particles of these lords of the gods, therefore he surpasses all living beings in brilliant energy, [*6*] and, like the Sun, he burns eyes and hearts, and no one on earth is able even to look at him. [*7*] Through his special power he becomes Fire and Wind; he is the Sun and the Moon, and he is (Yama) the King of Justice, he is Kubera and he is Varuṇa, and he is great Indra. [*8*] Even a boy king should not be treated with disrespect, with the thought, 'He is just a human being'; for this is a great deity standing there in the form of a man.

[*9*] Fire burns just one man who approaches it wrongly, but the fire of a king burns the whole family, with its livestock and its heap of possessions. [*10*] In order to make justice succeed, he takes all forms again and again, taking into consideration realistically what is to be done, (his) power, and the time and place. [*11*] The lotus goddess of Good Fortune resides in his favour, victory in his aggression, and death in his anger; for he is made of the brilliant energy of all (the gods). [*12*] The man who is so deluded as to hate him will certainly be destroyed, for the king quickly makes up his mind to destroy him. [*13*] Therefore no one should violate the justice that the king dispenses for those that please him nor the unpleasant justice (that he dispenses) differently for those that displease him. [*14*] For (the king's) sake the Lord in ancient times emitted the Rod of Punishment, his own son, (the incarnation of) Justice, to be the protector of all living beings, made of the brilliant energy of ultimate reality. [*15*] Through fear of him all living beings, stationary and moving, allow themselves to be used and do not swerve from their own duty. [*16*] Upon men who persist in behaving unjustly he should inflict the punishment they deserve, taking into consideration realistically (the offender's) power and learning and the time and place. [*17*] The Rod is the king and the man, he is the inflicter and he is the chastiser, traditionally regarded as the guarantor for the duty of the four stages of life. [*18*] The Rod alone chastises all the subjects, the Rod protects them, the Rod stays awake while they sleep; wise men know that

justice is the Rod. [*19*] Properly wielded, with due consideration, it makes all the subjects happy; but inflicted without due consideration, it destroys everything.

[*20*] If the king did not tirelessly inflict punishment on those who should be punished, the stronger would roast the weaker like fish on a spit. [*21*] The crow would eat the sacrificial cake and the dog would lick the oblation; there would be no ownership in anyone, and (everything) would be upside down. [*22*] The whole world is mastered by punishment, for an unpolluted man is hard to find. Through fear of punishment everything that moves allows itself to be used. [*23*] The gods, the titans, the centaurs, the ogres, the birds and the snakes, even they allow themselves to be used, but only when under pressure from punishment. [*24*] All the classes would be corrupted, and all barriers broken, all people would erupt in fury as a result of a serious error in punishment.

[*25*] Where the Rod moves about, black and with red eyes, destroying evil, there the subjects do not get confused, as long as the inflicter sees well. [*26*] They say that a king is a (proper) inflicter of punishment when he speaks the truth, acts after due consideration, is wise, and is conversant with religion, pleasure, and profit. [*27*] A king who inflicts punishment correctly thrives on the triple path, but if he is lustful, partial, and mean, he is destroyed by that very punishment. [*28*] For punishment has great brilliant energy, and for those who are undisciplined it is hard to maintain; if a king swerves from justice it strikes him down, together with his relatives, [*29*] and then his fort, his territory, and the whole world, with all that moves and does not move; it even oppresses the gods and the hermits who have gone to the atmosphere. [*30*] (Punishment) cannot be inflicted according to the right standards by anyone who has no assistant, by a fool, by anyone who is greedy or whose mind is undisciplined or who is attached to the sensory objects. [*31*] Punishment can be inflicted rightly by someone who has a good assistant, who is wise and unpolluted, who keeps his promises and who acts in accordance with the teachings.

[*32*] He should uphold the right standards in his own realms and inflict severe punishment among his enemies, without bias toward his close friends and with patience towards priests. [*33*] If a king behaves like this, even though he makes his living by gleaning (corn) and gathering (single grains), his fame spreads throughout the world like a drop of oil on water. [*34*] But the fame of a king who is the opposite of this, who has not conquered himself, congeals in the world like a drop of clarified butter in water. [*35*] The king was created as the protector of the classes and the stages of life, that are appointed each to its own particular duty, in proper order.

[36] I will explain to you, properly and in order, the various things that he must do, together with his retainers, to protect his subjects.

[37] The king should rise early in the morning, attend respectfully to learned priests who have grown old in the study of the triple learning, and abide by their advice. [38] He should always serve unpolluted old priests who know the Veda; for a man who serves old people is always revered, even by ogres. [39] He should learn humility from them even if he is always humble, for the king who is humble is never destroyed. [40] Many kings have been destroyed, together with their entourages, through lack of humility, while even forest-dwellers have won kingdoms through humility. [41] Vena was destroyed through lack of humility, and so was king Nahusa, Sudās the son of Pījavana, Sumukha, and Nimi. [42] But through humility Prthu won a kingdom, and so did Manu, and Kubera become Lord of Wealth, and (Viśvāmitra) the son of Gādhi became a priest.

[43] From those who have the triple learning he should acquire the triple learning, the eternal science of politics and punishment, philosophy, and the knowledge of the soul; and from the people (he should learn) the trades and enterprises.

[44] Day and night he should make a great effort to conquer his sensory powers, for the man who has conquered his sensory powers is able to keep his subjects under his control. [45] He should make a great effort to avoid the ten vices that arise from desire and the eight that are born of anger, which (all) end badly. [46] For a king who is addicted to the vices born of desire and pleasure loses his religion and profit, but (if he is addicted to the vices) born of anger (he loses) his very self. [47] Hunting, gambling, sleeping by day, malicious gossip, women, drunkenness, music, singing, dancing, and aimless wandering are the group of ten (vices) born of desire.

[48] Slander, physical violence, malice, envy, resentment, destruction of property, verbal abuse, and assault are the group of eight (vices) born of anger. [49] But he should make an effort to conquer greed, which all poets know is the root of both of these groups; both are born of it. [50] Drinking, gambling, women, and hunting, in that order, he should know to be the very worst four in the group (of vices) born of desire. [51] And he should know that bodily assault, verbal abuse, and destruction of property are always the very worst three in the group (of vices) born of anger. [52] A self-possessed man should know that, of this cluster of seven that is universally addictive, each vice is more serious than the one that follows. [53] Between vice and death, vice is said to be worse; a man with vices sinks down and down, but a man without vices goes to heaven when he dies.

[54] (The king) should appoint seven or eight advisers who are

hereditary and know the teachings, who are brave and have distinguished themselves, who are well born and well tested. [*55*] Even a deed that is easy to do is hard for one man to do alone; how much harder (for a king to rule) a highly productive kingdom, especially if he has no assistant. [*56*] Together with them he should always consider ordinary matters of peace and war, the condition (of the kingdom), its wealth and protection, and the consolidation of gains. [*57*] When he has got the opinion of each of them individually, separately, and of all of them together, he should arrange in his affairs what is best for himself.

[*58*] But the king should take counsel about the most important concerns of the six-fold policy with an intelligent priest who is the most distinguished of them all. [*59*] He should always be confident in him and entrust all his affairs to him, and when he has made his decision with him he should then begin his action. [*60*] He should also appoint other ministers, unpolluted, wise, firm, who collect money properly and have been well tested. [*61*] He should appoint as many tireless, skilful, clever men as are needed to accomplish the job to be done. [*62*] Of them, he should use those who are brave, skilful, and well-born, in financial matters; those who are unpolluted, in mines and manufacturing; and the timid in the interior of the palace.

[*63*] And he should appoint as an ambassador a man who is well versed in all the teachings, who understands involuntary movements, facial expressions, and gestures, and who is unpolluted, skilful, and well-born. [*64*] The man who is well liked, unpolluted, and skilful, who has a good memory and knows (the proper) time and place, who is good-looking, fearless, and eloquent, is recommended to be a king's ambassador. [*65*] The army depends on the minister (of defence), military and disciplinary activity on the army, the treasury and kingdom on the king, and peace and its opposite on the ambassador. [*66*] For it is the ambassador who unites and who divides those who are united; the ambassador does the deed by which men are divided. [*67*] Through secret involuntary movements and gestures, (the ambassador) should learn the facial expressions, involuntary movements, and gestures (of the other king concerned) in his affairs, and (he should learn) among his servants what he intends to do. [*68*] And when he has found out accurately all that the other king intends to do, he should take pains to prevent any harm to himself.

[*69*] (The king) should settle in dry, open country with plenty of grain, charming and not marshy, where most of the inhabitants are Aryans, the neighbours have been made to bow down, and there is a livelihood for his own (people). [*70*] He should establish a town there, relying for shelter upon the fortification of a desert, or of earth, or of water, or of trees, or of men, or of a hill. [*71*] But he should make

every effort to rely for shelter upon a hill fort, for among these (six forts) a hill fort is distinguished by many good qualities. [*72*] The first three of these (forts) are inhabited by wild animals, animals that live in holes, and aquatic animals; the last three by monkeys, men, and immortals, in that order. [*73*] Just as their enemies do not injure these (creatures) when they take shelter in their forts, so enemies do not injure a king when he takes shelter in his fort. [*74*] One bowman stationed on the ramparts fights off a hundred; a hundred (fight off) ten thousand; and therefore a fort is prescribed.

[*75*] That (fort) should be fully equipped with weapons, with money, grain, and animals to ride, with priests, artisans, machines, fodder, and water. [*76*] In the middle of it he should have made for himself a spacious house for all seasons, well protected, beautiful, provided with water and trees. [*77*] When he has moved into it, he should marry a charming wife of his own class, born in a great family, one who has (the right) marks as well as beauty and good qualities.

[*78*] He should appoint a personal priest and officiating priests, who should perform for him the domestic rituals and those that involve three sacrificial fires. [*79*] The king should offer various sacrifices with fitting sacrificial gifts, and he should give luxurious objects and money to the priests for religious purposes. [*80*] He should have trustworthy people collect the annual tax from his kingdom, and he should bear in mind what has been handed down and held in memory among the people; he should behave to men like a father. [*81*] He should appoint various intelligent superintendents for this job and that, and they should inspect all that is done by the men who carry out his affairs.

[*82*] He should be reverent to priests who have returned from their guru's family, for that is said to be the incorruptible Vedic treasure of kings. [*83*] Neither thieves nor enemies take it away, and it is not destroyed; therefore the king should deposit this incorruptible treasure among priests. [*84*] What is offered as an oblation in the mouth of a priest is better than daily fire sacrifices; it is never spilt, dropped, or destroyed. [*85*] A gift to a non-priest yields the basic (reward); to someone who says he is a priest, double; to a teacher, a hundred thousand (times); and to one who has crossed to the far shore of the Veda, endless (reward). [*86*] For a small or great reward for a gift is obtained after death according to the particular qualities and the amount of faith of the recipient.

[*87*] When a king who protects his subjects is challenged by kings who are his equal or stronger or weaker, he should remember the duties of rulers and not turn away from battle. [*88*] Not turning away from battle, protecting subjects, and obedience to priests are the ultimate source of what is best for kings. [*89*] Kings who try to kill

one another in battle and fight to their utmost ability, never averting their faces, go to heaven. [*90*] Fighting in a battle, he should not kill his enemies with weapons that are concealed, barbed, or smeared with poison or whose points blaze with fire. [*91*] He should not kill anyone who has climbed on a mound, or an impotent man, or a man who folds his hands in supplication, or whose hair is unbound, or anyone who is seated or who says, 'I am yours'; [*92*] nor anyone asleep, without armour, naked, without a weapon, not fighting, looking on, or engaged with someone else; [*93*] nor anyone whose weapons have been broken, or who is in pain, badly wounded, terrified, or fleeing – for he should remember the duties of good men. [*94*] But if a man flees from a battle in terror and is killed by others, he takes upon himself all the evil deeds of his master, whatever they may be; [*95*] and whatever (credit for) good deeds a man has earned for the hereafter, if he is killed while fleeing, his master takes all that upon himself. [*96*] Horses and chariots, elephants, parasols, money, grain, livestock, women, all sorts of things and non-precious metals belong to the man who wins them. [*97*] But the revealed Vedic canon says, 'They must give the king a special portion of the booty.' And the king must distribute to all the fighters whatever has not been won individually.

[*98*] The unembellished, eternal duty of warriors has thus been explained; a ruler who kills his enemies in battle should not slip from this duty.

[*99*] (The king) should try hard to get what he has not got and to guard what he has got; he should make what he guards grow, and he should deposit in worthy receptacles of charity what he has made to grow. [*100*] He should realize that these are the four ways of accomplishing the human goals; never tiring, he should strive to employ them properly. [*101*] By means of his army he should seek what he has not got; by careful attention he should guard what he has got; he should make what he guards grow by means of interest; and he should deposit in worthy receptacles of charity what he has made to grow.

[*102*] His rod should be constantly erect, his manliness constantly displayed; matters that are to be concealed should be concealed constantly, and he should constantly search for his enemy's weak spot. [*103*] The whole universe trembles before (a king) whose rod is constantly erect; he should therefore subjugate all living beings by that very rod. [*104*] He should behave without deceit, never with deceit; but he should recognize deceit when an enemy employs it and always be on his guard. [*105*] His enemy should not find out his weak spot, but he should find out his enemy's weak spot. He should hide the members of the state as a turtle (hides his limbs), and he should guard

his own vulnerable point. [*106*] He should plan his undertakings like a heron, attack like a lion, pounce on his prey like a wolf, and retreat like a rabbit.

[*107*] When he is engaged in conquest in this manner, he should use conciliation and the other (three) expedients to bring under his control all those who may stand in his way. [*108*] But if they cannot be stopped by the first three expedients, he should overpower them by physical force and gradually bring them under his control. [*109*] Of the four expedients, conciliation and so forth, wise men recommend conciliation and physical force to make a kingdom grow constantly.

[*110*] Just as a reaper pulls up the weeds and guards the grain, so a king should guard his kingdom and destroy those who stand in his way. [*111*] If a king is so deluded and unthinking as to starve his own kingdom, he, together with his relatives, will soon lose his kingdom and his life. [*112*] Just as the vital breath of those that breathe is destroyed by the torment of the body, so even the vital breath of kings is destroyed by the torment of the kingdom.

[*113*] He should constantly follow this system for running his kingdom, for a king whose kingdom is well run thrives happily.

[*114*] In the midst of two, three, five, or a hundred villages he should establish a company of soldiers under command, to run the kingdom. [*115*] He should appoint an overlord of (each) village, and a lord of ten villages, and a master of twenty, and a master of a hundred, and a lord of a thousand. [*116*] The village head himself should regularly inform the master of ten (villages) about the problems that arise in the village; and the master of ten (villages) (should inform) the master of twenty. [*117*] The master of twenty should report all of that to the master of a hundred, and the master of a hundred villages should personally inform the lord of a thousand. [*118*] The village head should obtain the food, water, fuel, and so forth that the people who live in the village are to give to the king every day. [*119*] The (master) of ten (villages) should get the benefits of (the land of) one family; the (master) of twenty, of five families; the superintendent of a hundred villages, of a village, and the overlord of a thousand, a town.

[*120*] Another adviser of the king, unctuous and untiring, should inspect the affairs of these (overlords) that are connected with the villages as well as their separate individual affairs. [*121*] And in every city he should appoint one man to look after all matters, someone of high status and formidable appearance, like a planet among the stars. [*122*] That man should always personally make the rounds of all those (village overlords) and should find out thoroughly, through his spies, what they are doing in their districts. [*123*] For the men who are

appointed by the king to protect (his subjects) generally become hypocrites who take the property of others, and he must protect those subjects from them. [*124*] The king should banish and confiscate all the property of those evil-minded men who take the money from parties to lawsuits.

[*125*] He should establish a daily livelihood for women employed in work for the king and for menial servants, according to their status and the work. [*126*] A penny should be given as a wage to the lowest, and six to the highest, as well as clothing every six months and a 'bucket' of grain every month. [*127*] He should make merchants pay taxes, taking into consideration the purchase and sale (prices), the journey, and the (expenses for) food and supplies and security measures. [*128*] The king should always establish the taxes in his kingdom after due consideration, in such a way that both the king and the man who does the work are rewarded. [*129*] Just as the leech, the calf, and the bee eat their food little by little, so the king should take the yearly taxes from the kingdom little by little. [*130*] The king should take a fiftieth part of livestock and gold and an eighth, or a sixth, or a twelfth, of crops. [*131*] And he should take a sixth part of trees, meat, honey, and melted butter, perfumes, medicinal herbs, and spices, flowers, roots, and fruits, [*132*] leaves, vegetables, and grasses, animal hides and things made of bamboo, pots made of clay, and anything made of stone.

[*133*] Even if he is dying (of hunger), a king must not take taxes from a priest who knows his Veda by heart, and no priest who knows his Veda by heart living in his territory should faint with hunger. [*134*] If a priest who knows his Veda by heart faints with hunger, the kingdom of the king in whose territory he lives will also soon faint with hunger. [*135*] (The king) should find out about his knowledge of the revealed canon and his behaviour and then devise a livelihood in keeping with his duty, and he should protect him in every way, as a father (protects) his natural son. [*136*] The king's lifespan, wealth, and kingdom are increased by whatever religious merit (such a priest) accomplishes every day while he is protected by the king.

[*137*] The king should have the common people in his kingdom who live by trade pay something, no matter what, each year, and call it taxes. [*138*] The king should have manual labourers, artisans, and servants who live on their own labour work (for him) one day every month. [*139*] He should not, through excessive thirst, cut off his own root or that of others, for by cutting off his own root he would injure himself and them. [*140*] The king should be both sharp and gentle when he hears a case, for a king who is both sharp and gentle is respected.

[*141*] When he is tired of hearing men's cases, he should establish

his chief minister in that post, a man who knows justice and is wise, controlled, and born of a good family. [*142*] When he has in this way disposed of everything that he himself is to do, he should protect his subjects diligently and without carelessness. [*143*] (That king) is dead and does not live, from whose kingdom aliens carry off his subjects, screaming, while he and his retainers look on. [*144*] The supreme duty of a ruler is to protect his subjects, for a king who enjoys the rewards described above is bound to (that) duty.

[*145*] He should arise in the last watch of the night and, unpolluted and with a concentrated mind, offer an oblation into the fire; then he should honour the priests and enter his fine court-room. [*146*] He should stay there greeting all his subjects, and then dismiss them; and when he has dismissed all his subjects he should take counsel with his counsellors. [*147*] He should take counsel unobserved, climbing to a private place on the back of a hill or a roof-terrace, or in a wilderness that has no vegetation. [*148*] A king whose counsel is not known by the common people when they come together will enjoy the entire earth even if he has a poor treasury. [*149*] At the time of taking counsel he should have removed idiots, the mute, blind, or deaf; animals and very old people; women, barbarians, and those who are ill or who lack a part of the body. [*150*] For those who are despised disclose counsel, and so do animals and, especially, women; therefore he should be cautious among them. [*151*] At noon or midnight, when he has rested and overcome his weariness, he should think, either alone or with those (advisers), about religion, profit, and pleasure, [*152*] and about attaining them when they are mutually opposed, about giving his daughters in marriage and protecting his sons, [*153*] about sending ambassadors and finishing what has to be done, about what is going on in the harem and the movements of his secret agents.

[*154*] And (he should think), realistically, about the entire eight-fold activity (of a king) and the five-fold class (of other members), about affection and disaffection and what is being done by the circle (of neighbouring states), [*155*] and (think) hard about what is being done by the king in-between and the movements of the king who wishes to conquer, and about what is being done by the neutral king and the enemy. [*156*] These are, in summary, the (four) basic elements of the circle; and eight more are enumerated, so that there are traditionally said to be twelve. [*157*] And five other (members of the state) are enumerated: the ministers, territory, forts, treasury, and army. When these are counted separately (for each of the twelve elements or kings) they make a total of seventy-two. [*158*] The king should regard as his enemy both the king who is his immediate neighbour and any partisan of that enemy; and (he should regard) as his ally the immediate neighbour of his enemy, and as neutral (the

king) beyond these two.

[*159*] He should subdue all of these by conciliation and the (three) other expedients, used singly or in combination, and by manliness and political policy. [*160*] And he should always bear in mind the six tactics (of political policy): alliance, war, marching, camping, dichotomy, and seeking refuge. [*161*] When he has considered what has to be done, he should make use of alliance or war, marching or camping, dichotomy or seeking refuge.

[*162*] But the king should know that there are two kinds of alliance and two kinds of war, and two kinds of marching and camping, and two kinds of seeking refuge. [*163*] Alliance, which has both present and future (consequences), should be known to have two distinguishing marks: when (the two kings) march together, or the opposite. [*164*] War is traditionally regarded as being of two kinds: waged of one's own accord and for (one's own) purpose or to avenge an ally, at the right time or the wrong time. [*165*] Marching is said to be of two kinds: alone, when an urgent matter arises by chance, or accompanied by an ally. [*166*] Camping is traditionally regarded as being of two kinds: when (the king) has been gradually weakened by fate or by (the consequences of) his former deeds, or to oblige an ally. [*167*] Those who know the qualities of the six tactics say that dichotomy, too, is two-fold: the army and its master stop (in two different places) to achieve the goal of an undertaking. [*168*] Seeking refuge is traditionally regarded as being of two kinds: for the sake of accomplishing a goal when one is hard pressed by enemies, and, among virtuous (kings), under a pretext. [*169*] He should engage in an alliance when he understands that his own future superiority is certain and that he is little pressed at present. [*170*] But he should wage war when he thinks that all his subjects are in very high spirits and that he himself has grown exceedingly mighty. [*171*] He should march against the enemy when he thinks that his own army is in high spirits and thriving and that the enemy's (army) is the opposite. [*172*] And he should camp carefully, gradually conciliating his enemies, when he is very weak in his army and in his vehicles. [*173*] The king should accomplish his own undertaking by making a dichotomy of the army when he thinks that the enemy is stronger in every way. [*174*] But he should seek refuge quickly with a strong, righteous king when he is most vulnerable to the enemy's armies. [*175*] He should constantly and with every effort serve like a guru the man who can control both his subjects and the enemy army. [*176*] If he sees a disadvantage in taking refuge even with him, then, even then, he should without hesitation fight a good fight. [*177*] A king who knows political policy should make use of all the expedients to see that allies, neutral kings, and enemies do not become superior to him. [*178*] He should

realistically consider the future and present of all undertakings, and the advantages and shortcomings of all past (undertakings). [*179*] If he knows the advantages and disadvantages (of his undertakings) in the future, can make quick decisions in the present, and knows the results of his undertakings in the past, he will not be overpowered by enemies. [*180*] He should arrange everything in such a way that allies, neutral kings, and enemies do not overmaster him; this is political policy in a nutshell.

[*181*] But when a ruler marches against an enemy's kingdom, then he should march gradually against the enemy's fortress in the following manner. [*182*] The king should march in the fine month of mid-November to mid-December or around the months of mid-February to mid-April, depending on (the condition of) his army. [*183*] But he may also march to make war at other times, when he sees that victory is certain or when some disaster has befallen his enemy. [*184*] He should make the arrangements correctly at his base and for the march, secure his position, establish his spies properly, [*185*] clear and secure the three kinds of roads and his own six-fold army, and gradually advance against the enemy's fortress in the martial manner. [*186*] He should be especially careful in dealing with an ally who secretly serves the enemy or towards anyone who has deserted and returned, for such a man is the worst enemy. [*187*] He should march on the road with the army in the formation of a rod, a cart, a boar, a crocodile, a needle, or an eagle.

[*188*] He should deploy his army in any direction from which he suspects danger, and he should always set himself (in the midst of) the army in the lotus formation. [*189*] He should set his general and captain (and their men) on all sides, and he should arrange his front to face in any direction from which he suspects danger. [*190*] He should establish on all sides troops who are trustworthy and who have arranged signals, who are skilled at standing firm and at fighting, fearless and unwavering. [*191*] He should have a few soldiers fight in close ranks, if he wishes, or have many of them spread out; he should deploy them in the formation of a needle or a thunderbolt and have them fight. [*192*] He should fight with horses and chariots on level ground, and with boats and elephants on marshes, with bows on ground covered with trees and shrubs, and with swords, shields, and similar weapons on mounds. [*193*] He should send to fight in the vanguards Matsyas, Pañcālas, and natives of the Field of the Kurus and Sūrasena, as well as tall and lightweight men. [*194*] When he has deployed the army he should exhort them and inspect them carefully; and he should also find out how they act when they are fighting the enemy.

[*195*] When he has besieged the enemy he should encamp and

harass his kingdom, and he should constantly spoil his fodder, food, water, and fuel. [*196*] He should break the tanks, ramparts, and ditches, and ambush him, and terrify him at night. [*197*] He should talk over to his side those who can be talked over, and find out what (the enemy) has done, and, when fate is favourable, fearlessly fight to win.

[*198*] He should try to conquer his enemies by conciliation, bribery, and dissension, either together or separately, but never by fighting. [*199*] For since it can be observed that neither victory nor defeat belongs permanently to either of two powers who fight in battle, therefore he should avoid fighting. [*200*] But if even the three expedients mentioned above cannot be used, he should be prepared to fight in such a way as to conquer his enemies.

[*201*] When he has conquered, he should worship the gods and the priests who are religious; he should grant tax exemptions and proclaim promises of safety. [*202*] And when he has concisely ascertained the intentions of all those (conquered people), he should set on that (throne) someone in the dynasty of that (vanquished king) and establish a treaty. [*203*] He should make authoritative their own laws, as they have been declared, and with jewels he should honour (the new king), together with the important men. [*204*] Taking things that people want causes displeasure and giving them causes pleasure, and each is recommended if employed at the proper time. [*205*] All of this activity depends on both divine and human disposition, but of the two of these the divine cannot be imagined, while it is possible to do something about the human.

[*206*] Or he may take pains to join with (the conquered king) in an alliance and go away, realizing that an ally, gold, and territory are the triple fruit (of conquest). [*207*] And when he has carefully observed the heel-snatcher in the circle, as well as the one who attacks the heel-snatcher, he should reap the fruit of the march from his ally or his enemy. [*208*] A (conquering) king increases his power not so much through obtaining gold and territory as through gaining a firm ally, who, even though weak (at present, may become) capable in the future. [*209*] (Even) an insignificant ally is recommended (if he) understands justice, is grateful, loyal, and firm in his undertakings, and his people are satisfied. [*210*] Intelligent men say that the worst enemy is one who is intelligent, well-born, brave, clever, generous, grateful, and firm. [*211*] An Aryan nature, an understanding of men, heroism, a compassionate disposition, and wide aims at all times are the advantageous virtues of a neutral (king).

[*212*] To save himself, a king should without hesitation give up territory even if it is salubrious, always yields good crops, and livestock thrive on it. [*213*] He should save money for an extreme

emergency; he should save his wife even at the cost of his money; he should always save himself, even at the cost of his wife and his money. [*214]* When an intelligent man realizes that all sorts of extreme emergencies have arisen together, he should try all (four) expedients, together or separately. [*215*] Taking into consideration this triad – the person using the expedient, what is to be accomplished by the expedient, and all the expedients – he should try to achieve his goal.

[*216*] When the king has taken counsel about all of this with his counsellors, and when he has exercised and bathed, he should enter the harem at noon to eat. [*217*] There he should eat food over which Vedic verses that dispel poison have been chanted, food that has been well tested by kitchen servants who are like his second self, who cannot be seduced and who know the time (for food). [*218*] And he should clean all of his articles with waters that destroy poison, and he should always be circumspect about wearing jewels that destroy poison. [*219*] Well-tested women whose clothing and ornaments have been thoroughly cleaned should attentively caress him with fans, water, and incense. [*220*] In the same way, he should be careful about his carriage, bed, seat, and food, and about bathing, anointing and adorning his body, and all his ornaments.

[*221*] When he has eaten, he should take his pleasure with the women in the harem; and when he has taken his pleasure at the proper time, he should think again about the things he must do. [*222*] In full regalia, he should inspect the armed forces again, and all the vehicles, weapons, and ornaments. [*223*] When he has performed his twilight rituals, he should arm himself, and in the inner chamber he should hear about the movements of his spies and those who report secrets. [*224*] When he has dismissed these people and gone to another inner chamber, he should again enter the harem to eat, surrounded by women. [*225*] When he has again eaten something there, his spirits lifted by instrumental music, he should lie down and then arise at the proper time free from fatigue.

[*226*] A king should follow this regime when he is healthy; but when he is not well, he may entrust all of this to his retainers.

End of Chapter 7

[2] The transformative ritual (*saṃskāra*) is the initiation, in this case more precisely the consecration as king.

[7] Here and in general throughout the discussion of the king's duty, *dharma* is best rendered as 'justice'.

[14] Yama, the king of the dead, is also called the King of Justice (*dharma*), and holds the rod of punishment (*daṇḍa*) in his hand. The king is regarded as another incarnation of this aspect of justice, who carries the rod as his sceptre (while the priest carries the

staff that he receives at initiation, also called *daṇḍa*).

[15] The phrase 'to be used' (*bhogāya*) might also be translated 'to be enjoyed or consumed'; the verb denotes eating, enjoying sexually, using up (as is said of the effects of past actions), and consuming (as fire consumes fuel). The commentator gives an example: trees allow themselves to be used by giving up their fruit, flowers, and so forth.

[17] Some commentators suggest that the rod is a man because it is through the rod that a king puts down and controls even those who are more powerful than he, as if they were women. Another suggests that compared with him other men are women; another that he is the soul of the primeval Man (*puruṣa*); another that the rod is the king's man, a policeman. The word translated as 'guarantor' (*pratibhū*) means more precisely a man who stands bail or a security posted as collateral.

[21] That is, no one would have any power or domination or ownership (*svāmyam*) over anyone else. The commentators predictably suggest that 'upside down' (*adharottaram*) means that servants would usurp the place of priests.

[23] The commentators note that the sun might not get up for two or three days if he were entirely independent. One quotes this scriptural passage (*Kaṭha Upaniṣad* 6.3, in which 'he' is *brahman*, ultimate reality): 'Through fear of him, fire heats, and through fear the sun heats; through fear Indra runs, and the wind, and death as the fifth.' Another commentator cites another canonical verse (*Taittirīya Upaniṣad* 2.8): 'Through fear of him the wind blows, and through fear the sun rises; through fear of him fire runs, and Indra, and death as the fifth.'

[26] That is, he is experienced in each of the three human goals or the triple path and knows the relative value of each and the correct relationship between them.

[29] The gods in heaven, and the hermits on earth, are oppressed by the failure of just punishment (and the consequent destruction of religion). As a result of men's failure to give sacrificial offerings, the gods are no longer maintained in heaven and descend to the atmosphere, while the hermits flee from earth to the same atmosphere. Some commentaries suggest that the gods remain in heaven, and that the phrase 'who have gone to the atmosphere' applies only to the hermits, but this makes less sense.

[33] 'Living by gleaning and gathering' is a technical term for a particularly modest kind of livelihood; see 4.5.

[39] 'Humility' (*vinaya*) can mean many things, including discipline or good manners. But the examples of proud and humble kings given in 7.41–2 suggest that humility – more precisely, the need for a king to humble himself before a priest – is what Manu has in mind here.

[41] Vena was an evil king who murdered people and prevented sacrifices until the priests killed him (*Mahābhārata* 12.59.99–103). Nahuṣa, a human king, rose to become another Indra in heaven until he had the audacity to proposition Indra's wife and to harness the Seven Sages to his chariot in place of horses, whereupon he was cursed to become a snake and fell from heaven (*Mahābhārata* 5.9–17). Sudās the son of Pījavana was a great king, with Viśvāmitra as his family priest and Vasiṣṭha as his enemy, until he had his men kill Vasiṣṭha's son Śakti, Viśvāmitra abandoned him, and he was defeated (ṛg *Veda* 7.18, 7.32, with Sāyaṇa's commentary); he reappears in the *Mahābhārata* (1.166–8) as Saudasa Kalmāṣapāda, where he again kills Śakti and Viśvāmitra curses him to become an ogre. Sumukha does not seem to appear in the Vedas or Epics. Nimi would not wait for his family priest, Vasiṣṭha, to return before he undertook a great sacrifice; Vasiṣṭha cursed him to lose his body; when he died, the priests churned his body to produce a son, Janaka of Videha (*Mahābhārata* 13.91; *Devībhāgavata Purāṇa* 6).

[42] The good kings in this verse are the counterparts, and often the relatives, of the evil kings in the previous verse. Pṛthu was the posthumous son of Vena, churned from Vena's dead body by the same priests that had killed him; Pṛthu re-established justice, provided food for his subjects, and became the founding king of the lunar line

(*Atharva Veda* 8.10.22–9; *Mahābhārata* 12.59.99–103). It is not clear which of the seven Manus mentioned by Manu (1.61–3), most of whom reigned as kings (their stories are told in detail in the *Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa*), is intended in this verse. The first Manu, the Son of the Self-born (*svāyambhuva*), is said to have been the author of *The Laws of Manu* and the ancestor of Vena and Pṛthu. It is the fifth Manu, the Son of the Gazing (*cākṣuṣa*), whose story best fits the present pattern: he asked the royal sage Pulaha to help him become master of the whole world, a goal that he eventually achieved (*Devībhāgavata Purāṇa* 10). But the seventh Manu, the Son of the Shining Sun (*vaivāsvata*), is by far the most famous, and his story is told in the oldest texts (*ṛg Veda* 10.72.8–9; *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* 3.1.3–5): he is the Manu who assisted Pṛthu, and the only commentator on this verse who identifies Manu calls him the Son of the Sun. Kubera (the counterpart of Nahusa, as the equal of Indra) became Lord of Wealth, one of the four Guardians of the World, as a result of his inner heat (*Mahābhārata* 9.46). Viśvāmitra (the counterpart, and acquaintance, of Sudās and Nimi) was born a king but, in competition with Vasiṣṭha, generated inner heat until he became a priest (*Mahābhārata* 1.164–5; 9.39; *Rāmāyaṇa* 1.51–6).

[46] *Kāma* here is both desire, in contrast with anger, and pleasure, one of the three human goals, in conflict with religion (*dharma*) and profit (*artha*).

[54] The political textbook, the *Arthaśāstra* (1.10.1–20), describes detailed traps that the king is to set for the ministers in charge of the uprooting of dissidents (the test of justice or religion, *dharma*), the treasury (the test of profit, *artha*), the harem (the test of pleasure or lust, *kāma*), and his bodyguards (the test of fear). The application of such tests is implicit in Manu 7.60 and 7.62.

[56] 'Consolidation of gains' may refer to the pacification of newly-acquired territory or the sanctification of acquisitions through gifts to temples and so forth.

[58] The six-fold policy of government is described in 7.56.

[67] 'Secret' gestures may mean the gestures that the ambassador himself conceals, that the other king conceals, the gestures of other men who conceal them, or the gestures of hidden men (i.e. his own spies or the spies of the other king).

[68] 'He' in this verse may be the king or the ambassador.

[69] The 'dry, open country' is *jāngala*, the very opposite of what 'jungle' means in English: it is hot but dry, with little water or lush vegetation.

[70] These may be natural fortifications or, as some commentators suggest, some natural and some man-made, of earth (brick and stones), water (a moat), or timber.

[82] The king reveres the students returning from Vedic study by giving them money, and that money, dispersed among priests, is regarded as a kind of royal investment.

[91] The folded hands, unbound hair, and words of surrender mark the man as a helpless supplicant. Climbing on a mound means, according to the commentators, that the man is on the ground and trying to scramble up to the level of the king, who is, presumably, still mounted on his chariot.

[97] The Vedic text referred to here is probably *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa* 3.21, in which Indra, the paradigmatic warrior king, kills the demon Vṛtra and then asks the gods to give him a special portion of the booty, but then refuses to give any of them a special portion.

[99] The worthy receptacles of charity (*pātras*) are good men to whom it is a privilege to give gifts. See 4.227.

[102] The first phrase may also mean, 'His army (*daṇḍa*) should be constantly ready (*udyata*).' The rod (*daṇḍa*) is a multivalent metaphor for the visible display of the king's official power, his personal manliness, his army, and his power to inflict punishment.

[105] The word for the six 'members' of the body (*angas*: arms, legs, head, and torso for a human king; legs, head, and tail for a turtle) also designates the parts of the state; these are traditionally regarded sometimes as six (enumerated in 7.157: the king, plus

his ministers, territory, forts, treasury, and army) and sometimes as seven (enumerated in 9.294: the same six, plus the ally).

[106] The heron is noted for his cunning and patience; see 4.195–7.

[107] The four expedients (*upakramas*) or means (*upāyas*), described at length in the *Arthaśāstra*, are conciliation, bribery, dissension, and physical force (*daṇḍa*, the army).

[119] The term 'family' (*kula*) is used here in a technical sense. It may designate the amount of land that a family can live off, or the amount that one man can plough; some commentators define it as twice the amount that can be ploughed by a plough with six oxen, or the amount that can be ploughed by twelve oxen. The verse may, however, mean that the master of ten villages gets the amount of taxes that one family pays, and the master of twenty, five times that amount, while the superintendent of a hundred gets the taxes from an entire village, and the overlord of a thousand, the taxes from a town.

[126] A penny (literally a 'chip') is defined at 8.136; a 'bucket' (*droṇa*) is approximately a fifth of a bushel, 21.25 lbs or 9.6 kg, defined as 256 'straws' or *palas* (for which, see 8.135).

[129] The animals in this verse may be more general – creatures that live in the water (including fish, who, as one commentator points out, drink very little water, for fear that they will destroy their own livelihood), young animals, and insects in general. But most commentators prefer the more specific animals, and remark that their food consists of blood, milk, and honey.

[143] The term *dasyu*, 'aliens', is more fully defined in the footnote to 5.131 and by Manu himself at 10.45.

[145] A watch (*yāma*) is three hours. The oblation would be offered at the very end of the watch, at dawn.

[149] Some commentators say that he should expel animals such as dogs and crows, which are inauspicious; others that he should expel parrots and mynahs, talking birds that might expose the counsel.

[154] The eight-fold activity of a king is variously described by various commentators; it may include the six expedients (conciliation and so forth) or the six-fold policy mentioned in 7.56, or the six tactics mentioned in 7.160. The five-fold class in other contexts usually designates the five elements of the body or sensory organs. Here it seems to be extended, quasi-metaphorically, to the 'senses' of the king – his spies, who are said, by the commentators, to consist of various religious hypocrites and down-and-out farmers and merchants. Other commentators suggest that it designates the five requirements for a royal enterprise, or the other five members of the state. The circle of enemies is described in 7.158.

[155] The king who wishes to conquer is the ideal king; the enemy is his enemy, of whom there are sometimes said to be three kinds: natural (sometimes someone of the same family), artificial (someone who becomes an enemy as a result of a particular situation), and the immediate neighbour (described in 7.158). The king in-between is the one whose territory is situated between the first two kings (and may become a danger to either or to both).

[156] According to Kāmandaki's *Nītisāra* (8.16–17), which the commentators cite throughout this section of Manu, the eight additional elements are divided into two groups: in front, beyond the enemy's territory, are the ally, the enemy's ally, the ally's ally, and the enemy's ally's ally; behind are the heel-snatcher (the king who attacks in the rear), the one who attacks the heel-snatcher, the adjacent ally of the heel-snatcher, and the adjacent ally of the one who attacks the heel-snatcher.

[157] Each element (*prakṛti*) of the circle, or king, has a kingdom consisting of himself plus the five other members of the state (*angas*), the traditional six members of the state. Twelve of these make seventy-two. (But seven members of the state are enumerated

at 9.294: the same six, plus the ally.)

[159] Political policy (*naya*) is the art of political manipulation, summed up in the six tactics listed in 7.160.

[163] This may mean that in the first case they march in the same direction, and in the second case in different directions; or simply that they either work together or work independently. It may also mean that the first instance yields present consequences and the second instance future consequences.

[164] The verse may indicate either that one wages war for one's own sake at both the right and the wrong time, or that one wages war for oneself at the right time and for an ally at the wrong time. The right time for war is described in 7.182.

[167] Dichotomy is by its very nature two-fold, involving a separation of two forces, though it does not take two different forms, as the other tactics are said to do.

[168] The meaning seems to be that, even when the king himself is not hard pressed by enemies, he might seek refuge under a virtuous king in order to prevent that king from being attacked by enemies.

[172] The vehicles would include carriages as well as carriage animals and beasts of burden, not merely horses but elephants and perhaps camels; the army (*bala*) would consist of troops.

[175] That is, he should seek refuge with such a man.

[182] The month of Mārgaśīrṣa ('the deer's head', mid-November to mid-December) is fine because, according to the commentaries, there is plenty of food and the roads are dry. Phālguna and Caitra are mid-February to mid-March and mid-March to mid-April. The condition of the army would include such considerations as the amount of food available, the nature of the journey to be undertaken in the march, and the condition of the men and animals.

[184] The commentators suggest that to 'secure his position' means to establish a camp within enemy territory or to win disaffected people over from the other side.

[185] The three kinds of roads go through open country (*jāngala*), marshes, and forests, or through villages, forests, and hills. The commentators agree that the first four of the six parts of the army are elephants, horses, chariots, and infantry; the last two are variously listed as the general and the workmen, the treasury and the workmen, or the riders of the horses and elephants and the weapon-bearers.

[187] The formation in the shape of a rod is in straight columns or an oblong; a cart is a wedge, broad in front and narrow in the back; the boar is a rhombus, pointed in the front and back and wide in the middle; the crocodile (or mythical sea-serpent, *makara*) is hour-glass shaped, narrow in the middle and broad in the front and back; the needle is a long line; and the eagle (or Garuḥa bird, a mythical eagle, king of the birds and the mount of the god Viṣṇu) is a rhombus like the boar, but with wide wings.

[188] One commentator explains that the lotus formation is a circle that spreads out on all sides, with the king in the middle.

[191] The formation of the thunderbolt or trident (*vajra*) is created by making a three-fold division of the troops.

[193] The peoples named in this verse are from areas in Northern India along the Ganges river, from Delhi to Mathurā.

[205] The word for 'the divine' (*daiva*) also means 'fate'.

[207] The heel-snatcher is a king who attacks in the rear; see 7.156n. The verse seems to be saying that the king should take advantage of his victorious march to make some sort, of alliance with the heel-snatcher (who, being the enemy of his enemy, is his ally) or the heel-snatcher's attacker (who, being the enemy of the enemy of his enemy, is his enemy).

CHAPTER 8

[*1*] A king who wishes to hear legal cases should enter the court-room modestly with priests and counsellors who know how to counsel. [*2*] Seated or standing there, wearing modest clothes and ornaments, he should raise his right hand and hear the cases of the parties to the lawsuits [*3*] every day, each individual (case) within the eighteen causes of legal action, in accordance with arguments taken from local practices and from authoritative teachings.

[*4*] These (causes) are: first, non-payment of debts; then, deposits; sale without ownership; partnerships; failure to deliver what has been given; [*5*] failure to pay wages; violation of an agreement; revocation of purchase and sale; disputes between the owner (of livestock) and the herdsman; [*6*] boundary disputes; assault; verbal abuse; theft; acts of physical violence; sexual misconduct with women; [*7*] the duties of a husband and wife; division (of inheritance); and gambling and betting (on animals). These are the eighteen causes of legal action here.

[*8*] (The king) should try, on the basis of eternal justice, the lawsuits of men who mostly dispute these topics. [*9*] But when the king does not hear the case himself, he should appoint a learned priest to hear the case. [*10*] (That priest) should enter the high court flanked by three judges and, seated or standing, he should hear the cases. [*11*] Where three priests who know the Vedas and a learned man appointed by the king sit (in judgement), that place is known as the court of Brahmā.

[*12*] But where justice, penetrated by injustice, approaches the court and the judges there do not cut the dart out of him, they (too) are penetrated there. [*13*] Either the court must not be entered or what is said must be honest; a man who speaks falsely or not at all is an offender. [*14*] For where justice is destroyed by injustice, and truth by falsehood, while the judges there look on, they are destroyed. [*15*] When justice is destroyed, it destroys; when justice is protected, it protects. Therefore justice must not be destroyed, or justice destroyed may kill us. [*16*] For lord justice is a bull (*vṛṣan*), and anyone who puts an end (*alam*) to it the gods regard as a base servant (*vṛṣala*); therefore one should not destroy justice. [*17*] Justice is the one friend who follows even after death, for everything else is lost along with the body. [*18*] One quarter of the injustice belongs to the one who causes it, one quarter to the witness, one quarter to all the judges, and one quarter to the king. [*19*] But where a man who should be condemned is condemned, the king is guiltless, the judges are free (from guilt), and the guilt falls (only) on the one who did it.

[*20*] A man who makes his living only by his birth (as a priest), or who merely says that he is a priest, may, at the king's pleasure, explain justice, but a servant never. [*21*] But if a servant makes decisions about justice while a king looks on, his kingdom sinks down like a cow in mud. [*22*] A kingdom overrun by atheists, where servants are in the majority and there are no twice-born men, is soon entirely destroyed, oppressed by famine and disease.

[*23*] (The king) should take his place on the throne of justice, with his body covered and his mind concentrated, bow low to the Guardians of the World, and begin to hear the case. [*24*] Recognizing both what is profitable and what is not profitable, and what is intrinsically just and unjust, he should hear all the cases of the parties in the order of their classes. [*25*] He should discover the inner emotion of men from the outward signs, by their voice, colour, involuntary movements, and facial expressions, by their gaze and their gestures. [*26*] The inner mind-and-heart is grasped by facial expressions, involuntary movements, gait, gesture, speech, and changes in the eyes and mouth.

[*27*] The king should protect the estate and other inherited property of a boy until he has come home (after his studies) or passed beyond his childhood. [*28*] In the same way, he should protect women who are barren or have no sons, who have no families, who are faithful wives, widows, or ill. [*29*] But if, while these women are alive, their own relatives take away this (property), a just king should punish them with the punishment for theft.

[*30*] If the owner of any property has disappeared, the king should keep it in trust for three years; within three years the owner may take it, and after that the king may take it. [*31*] If someone says, 'This is mine,' he should be questioned in accordance with the rules; if he describes the shape, the number, and so forth, he deserves that property as the owner. [*32*] But if he does not accurately declare the time and place (of the loss) and the colour, shape, and measurements of the lost property, then he deserves a fine equal to its value. [*33*] Now, the king may take a sixth part of property (thus) lost and found, or a tenth, or a twelfth, bearing in mind the laws of good men. [*34*] Property that has been lost and then found should be placed in the keeping of the appropriate people; if the king catches thieves trying to steal it he should have them killed by an elephant.

[*35*] If a man says truthfully of a treasure-trove, 'This is mine,' the king should take a sixth part of it, or a twelfth. [*36*] But if he lies, he should be fined an eighth of his own property, or a smaller fraction of the treasure, when its value has been calculated. [*37*] And when a learned priest finds a treasure that was previously hidden, he may take it even without leaving anything, for he is the overlord of

everything. [38] But when the king finds ancient treasure hidden in the earth, he should give half to the twice-born and put half in his treasury. [39] The king gets half of ancient treasures and minerals in the ground because he protects (it) and because he is the overlord of the earth.

[40] The king must give back to men of all classes property taken by thieves; a king who uses it for himself commits the offence of a thief. [41] Taking into consideration the laws of the castes, districts, guilds, and families, a king who knows justice should establish the particular law of each. [42] Men who carry out their own innate activities and engage each in his own particular innate activity become dear to people even when they are far away. [43] Neither the king nor even one of the king's men should start a lawsuit himself, nor ever swallow up a case brought by anyone else. [44] Just as a hunter traces the track of a wild animal by the drops of blood, even so the king should trace the track of justice by inference. [45] When he is engaged in a legal proceeding, he should examine the truth, the object of the dispute, himself, the witnesses, the time and place, and the form of the case. [46] He should ordain (as law) whatever may be the usual custom of good, religious twice-born men, if it does not conflict with (the customs of) countries, families, and castes.

[47] When a creditor urges (the king) for the recovery of a debt from a debtor, he should make the debtor give the creditor the money that he has proven due him. [48] He should make the debtor pay by forcing him through whatever means the creditor can use to obtain his own money. [49] By law, by legal action, by a trick, by the usual custom, and, fifth, by force, he may recover money that has been lent. [50] If a creditor recovers his money from a debtor by himself, the king should not prosecute him for recovering his own property. [51] But if a man denies a debt that has been proven by a legal instrument, (the king) should make him pay the money to the creditor, as well as a small fine, according to his ability.

[52] When a debtor has been told in court, 'Pay,' and he denies the debt, the plaintiff must call (a witness who was) at the place (where the debt was contracted), or adduce some other legal instrument. [53] If he calls someone who was not at the place or if he takes back what he has stated or does not realize that his earlier and subsequent statements of fact do not harmonize; [54] or if he states what he means to prove and then afterwards departs from it, or when questioned about a properly acknowledged statement of fact does not uphold it; [55] or if he converses with witnesses in a place where they should not converse, or does not wish to answer a question put to him, or rushes out; [56] or if he is told, 'Speak,' and does not speak, or does not prove what he has said, or does not know what comes first and

what comes last, then he loses his case.

[*57*] And if he says, 'I have witnesses,' but does not call them when he is told, 'Call them,' then a just king should declare that, on these grounds, he, too, has lost his case. [*58*] If the plaintiff does not speak, he should be subjected to corporal punishment or fined, in accordance with justice; if he does not speak out for three fortnights, according to justice he has lost his case. [*59*] If (a debtor) falsely denies a certain sum of money, or (a creditor) falsely claims it, the king should make both of them pay a fine of double the amount, for they do not understand justice. [*60*] If (a debtor) is brought to court by a creditor and, when questioned, denies (the debt), he must be proven (guilty) by at least three witnesses, in the presence of the king and the priests.

[61] I will tell you what kind of men can be made witnesses in legal proceedings brought by creditors, and how they must speak the truth.

[62] Householders, men with sons, men with ancient roots, born of ruler, commoner, or servant wombs, may be witnesses when called by a plaintiff, but not just anyone, except in extremity. [*63*] Trustworthy men among all the classes who know all the laws and are not greedy may be made witnesses in lawsuits, but (the king) must avoid (witnesses) who are the opposite. [*64*] People who are connected with the case, untrustworthy, companions or enemies, people whose mistakes have been revealed, who are suffering from diseases, or are corrupt should not be made (witnesses). [*65*] The king may not be made a witness, nor a workman or a travelling bard, nor a priest who knows his Veda by heart, nor one who carries the mere signs (of his social status) or who has given up all connections (with society), [*66*] nor a man who is entirely dependent, notorious, an alien, or engaged in the wrong activities, nor an old man, a child, a man who is all alone, a man of the lowest caste, or a man with defective sensory powers, [*67*] nor anyone in pain, drunk, crazy, oppressed by hunger or thirst, tormented by exhaustion or lust, nor an angry man or a thief.

[*68*] Women should be witnesses for women, and twice-born men for twice-born men who are like them; good servants for servants, and men born of the lowest castes for men of the lowest castes. [*69*] But anyone at all who has special knowledge may be a witness for the disputing parties (in a crime committed) in the interior of a house or in a wilderness or involving grievous bodily harm. [*70*] In the absence (of qualified witnesses, evidence) may be given even by a woman, a child, or an old man, or by a pupil, a relative, a slave, or a hired servant. [*71*] But it should be realized that what is said by a child or anyone who is old or ill, who (may) speak falsely in testifying, as well as by people of unsound mind, is not reliable. [*72*] And in all cases of acts of physical violence, theft, sexual misconduct, verbal abuse, and assault, the witnesses need not be scrutinized (very) carefully.

[*73*] Where there is a division of opinion among the witnesses, the king should accept (the evidence of) the majority; where the numbers are equal, (he should accept) those whose qualities are superior (to the others'); where the qualities are equally divided, (he should accept the evidence of) the priests. [*74*] Evidence based on what has been seen with one's own eyes or heard is acceptable; a witness who tells the truth in this way does not lose his religious merit or profit. [*75*] A witness who in a court of Aryans speaks falsely about something other than what he has seen or heard goes headlong to hell after death and loses heaven. [*76*] When someone, even if he has not been bound as a witness, sees or hears anything and is questioned about it, he should tell it just as he saw it or heard it. [*77*] One single man who is not greedy may be a witness, but not several women, even if they are unpolluted, because a woman's understanding is unreliable, nor even other men who are rife with bad qualities. [*78*] Only what (witnesses) say quite naturally about a legal proceeding should be accepted; whatever they say other than that, falsely, is useless for the purpose of justice.

[*79*] When the witnesses have arrived in the court in the presence of the plaintiff and the defendant, the interrogating judge should call on them, charging them in this way: [*80*] 'Whatever you know about what these two men did to one another in this case, tell all of it truthfully, for you are the witnesses in this matter. [*81*] A witness who speaks the truth in testifying wins magnificent worlds (after death) and unsurpassed renown here on earth; such speech is revered by Brahmā. [*82*] Anyone who tells lies in testifying is helplessly bound fast by Varuṇa's ropes for a hundred rebirths; therefore one should speak the truth in testifying. [*83*] A witness is purified by truth, and justice grows through truth; therefore witnesses of all classes must speak the truth. [*84*] For the self alone is the witness of the self, and the self is the refuge of the self; do not have contempt for your own self, the unsurpassed witness of men. [*85*] Evil-doers think, "No one is looking at us," but the gods are looking right at them, and so is their very own inner Man. [*86*] The sky, the earth, the waters, the heart, the moon, the sun, fire, Yama, and the wind, and night, and the two twilights, and justice know what is done by all who have bodies.'

[*87*] In the forenoon, (the king), unpolluted, should ask the unpolluted twice-born (witnesses), who (stand) facing north or facing east, to give true evidence in the presence of the gods and priests. [*88*] He should ask a priest by saying, 'Speak,' a ruler by saying, 'Speak the truth,' a commoner with (warnings about) cows, seed, and gold, and a servant with (warnings about) all the crimes:

[*89*] 'The worlds that are traditionally said to belong to the priest-killer, to the murderer of a woman or a child, to an ingrate or to

someone who injures a friend, those will belong to you if you speak falsely. [*90*] My dear man, whatever merit you have acquired since your birth, all of that will go to the dogs if you speak other (than the truth). [*91*] My good man, you may think about yourself and say, “I am alone,” but this hermit who sees merit and evil stays constantly in your heart. [*92*] This god who stays in your heart is Yama the son of the Shining Sun. If you do not argue with him, you need not go to the Ganges or to (the Field of) the Kurus. [*93*] The man who tells lies in testifying must go to beg from his enemy’s family, carrying a skull-bowl, naked, his head shaved, hungry and thirsty, and blind. [*94*] The guilty man who answers a question falsely when he is questioned in an inquiry of justice goes headlong to hell in blind darkness. [*95*] A man who says something in court that falls short of the facts, that he did not witness with his own eyes, is like a blind man who eats fish with the bones. [*96*] For the gods know no better man in this world than the man whose own wise, knowing soul does not doubt him when he talks.

[*97*] ‘Listen, my friend, to the enumeration, in order, of the number of relatives that a man destroys when he lies in testifying: [*98*] he destroys five by lying about livestock, and he destroys ten by lying about cows; he destroys a hundred by lying about horses, and a thousand by lying about men. [*99*] He kills the born and the unborn by lying in a matter that concerns gold, and he kills everything by lying about land; therefore you certainly should not lie about land. [*100*] And they say that (lying) about water, about sexual union and the carnal enjoyment of women, about all jewels that are born in water or are made of stone, is like (lying about) land. [*101*] Taking into consideration all of these faults that result from telling lies, you should tell everything straight-forwardly, just as you heard it and just as you saw it.’ [*102*] (The king) should treat like servants priests who tend cattle, who are merchants, workmen, travelling bards, menial servants, and usurers.

[*103*] A man who testifies in a concern for justice even though he knows that (the facts) in the case are other than what he says does not fall from the world of heaven; they call that the speech of the gods. [*104*] In a case where telling the truth would cause the death of a servant, commoner, ruler, or priest, one should tell a lie, for that is better than the truth. [*105*] Those who wish to make the supreme redemption for the guilt of that lie should sacrifice to Sarasvatī with consecrated pots of porridge dedicated to the goddess of speech. [*106*] Or he should make an oblation of clarified butter into the fire in accordance with the rules, reciting the pumpkin verses, or the ṛg Vedic verse to Varuṇa that begins, ‘Untie, Varuṇa, the uppermost rope,’ or the three verses to the waters. [*107*] If a man who is not ill

does not give evidence about a debt and so forth within three fortnights (after he is summoned), he incurs the entire debt and (must pay as a fine) a tenth part of the whole. [*108*] If a witness who has testifed is seen to experience sickness, a fire, or a death in the family within seven days, he must pay the debt and a fine.

[*109*] But if (the king) cannot find the truth about the facts when two men are disputing matters in which there are no witnesses, he may also get it by means of an oath. [*110*] Even the great sages and the gods swore oaths to decide cases, and Vasistha even swore an oath before (Sudās) the son of Pījavana. [*111*] An intelligent man should not swear an oath falsely even in a trifling matter, for a man who swears an oath falsely is destroyed after death and here on earth. [*112*] But there is no crime in a (false) oath about women whom one desires, marriages, fodder for cows, fuel, and helping a priest. [*113*] (The king) should have a priest swear by truth, a ruler by his horse and chariot and his weapons, a commoner by his cows, seed, and gold, and a servant by all the crimes. [*114*] Or he should have him carry fire, or have him plunge under water, or even touch the heads of his wives and children individually. [*115*] If the blazing fire does not burn him, and the waters do not buoy him up, and he meets with no disaster quickly, he should be recognized as unpolluted in his oath. [*116*] For long ago, when Vatsa was accused by his younger brother, the fire that is the spy of the universe did not burn even one of the hairs of his body, because of his truth.

[*117*] If false evidence has been given in any dispute, (the king) should re-try the case, and whatever has been done should be undone. [*118*] Evidence given through greed, confusion, fear, friendship, lust, anger, ignorance, or naivety is said to be invalid. [*119*] I will explain, in order, the particular punishments for anyone who lies in testifying in each of these circumstances: [*120*] (for giving false evidence) through greed, he should be fined a thousand pennies, and (for giving false evidence) through confusion, (he should be fined) at the first level; if through fear, he should be fined two of the middle level, and through friendship, four of the first level; [*121*] if through lust, ten of the first level; if through anger, three of the highest level; if through ignorance, two full hundreds, and if through naivety, just one hundred. [*122*] They say that wise men proclaimed these fines for false evidence to prevent a miscarriage of justice and to restrain injustice. [*123*] A just king should fine and banish the (lower) three classes if they give false evidence, but he should merely banish a priest.

[*124*] Manu the son of the Self-existent has proclaimed ten places on which the three (lower) classes may be punished, but a priest should depart uninjured: [*125*] the genitals, stomach, tongue, two

hands, and two feet as the fifth, and the eye, nose, two ears, property, and the body. [*126*] When the king has accurately ascertained the motive and the time and place, and has considered the strength (of the criminal to endure punishment) and the offence itself, he should have punishment brought down upon those who should be punished. [*127*] Unjust punishment injures the reputation and destroys the fame (of the king) in this world, and keeps him from heaven in the next world; therefore he should avoid it entirely. [*128*] A king who punishes those who should not be punished and does not punish those who should be punished gets a very bad reputation and then goes to hell. [*129*] First he should punish with (normal) speech, and right after that with exclamations of reproof; but the third punishment is (confiscation) of property, and after that comes the last, corporal or capital punishment. [*130*] But when he cannot repress them even by corporal or capital punishment, then he should use even this entire quartet on them.

[*131*] I will explain, leaving nothing out, the names of (the weights of) copper, silver, and gold that people normally use to do business on earth.

[*132*] The tiny speck of dust that is seen when the sun shines through a lattice window is said to be the first measurement and is called a 'quivering atom'. [*133*] Eight 'quivering atoms' are considered equal in measurement to one 'louse-egg'; three of these ('louse-eggs') equal one 'black mustard-seed', and three of these ('black mustard-seeds') equal one 'white mustard-seed'. [*134*] Six (white) 'mustard-seeds' equal one medium-sized 'barley-corn', and three 'barley-corns' make one 'berry'; five 'berries' make a 'bean', sixteen 'beans' a 'gold-piece'. [*135*] Four 'gold-pieces' equal a 'straw', ten 'straws' make a 'support'; two 'berries' (of silver), weighed together, equal one silver 'small bean'. [*136*] Sixteen of these ('small beans') make a silver 'support' or an 'old coin'; but a penny of copper weighing as much as a 'scratch' is known as a 'scratch-penny'. [*137*] Ten 'supports' (of silver) should be known as a silver 'hundred-weight'; and four 'gold-pieces' are one 'gold ornament'.

[*138*] Two hundred and fifty pennies is traditionally regarded as the lowest level (of fine), five (hundred) is regarded as the middle level, and a thousand is the highest.

[*139*] If it has been acknowledged that a debt must be paid, (the debtor) deserves to pay five per cent (as a fine); if it has been denied (and proved), the fine is double that; this is Manu's instruction. [*140*] A money-lender may use an interest rate to increase his capital as Vasistha decreed, and take one and a quarter per cent every month. [*141*] Or, if he bears in mind the laws of good men, he may take two per cent, for a man who takes two per cent commits no offence for

profit. [*142*] He may take as monthly interest two, three, four, or five per cent, in order of class.

[*143*] But he may not collect interest on the loan of a pledge that has been pawned with him to use freely, nor can he discard or sell that pledge after he has kept it for a long time. [*144*] A pledge must not be made use of by force, and the man who uses it must give up the interest; he must satisfy (the owner) by paying its original price, or else he would be a pledge-thief. [*145*] Neither a pledge nor something loaned for personal use should be lost through time, for both of them may be taken back (even) when they have been kept for a long time. [*146*] Things that are used with good will are never lost – a cow, a camel, a carriage horse, or (an animal) that is being broken in. [*147*] But if an owner watches in silence for ten years while something (of his) is used by others in his presence, he does not deserve to get it back. [*148*] If something that belongs to a man who is neither an idiot nor immature is used while he is within range, it is legally lost; the one who uses it deserves to have it. [*149*] A pledge, a boundary, the property of a child, a deposit, something loaned for personal use, women, the possessions of a king, and the possessions of a priest who knows his Veda by heart, are not lost as a result of being used (by someone else). [*150*] Anyone who is so stupid as to use a pledge without the permission of its owner must give up half the interest as redemption for its use.

[*151*] Interest from money-lending paid at one time should not exceed double (the principal), but on grain, produce, fleece, or draught animals it should not exceed five times (the principal). [*152*] Excessive interest above the customary rate is not legal, and they call this the path of money-lending; a man has a right to five per cent. [*153*] He should not take interest that extends for more than a year or that is not recognized, nor compound interest, periodical interest, forced interest, or corporal interest. [*154*] If a man is unable to pay a debt and wishes to make a new contract, he may pay the interest that is due and turn around the legal instrument. [*155*] If he cannot produce the gold, he should turn it around into that very (agreement), but he must (eventually) pay as much interest as has accrued.

[*156*] If a man has imposed compound interest (on a debtor) and has stipulated the time and place (of payment), he should not reap the fruit of it if he lets the time and place go by. [*157*] When men who are expert in ocean transportation, and can calculate the time, place, and goods, establish an interest rate, that is the rate for the payment of that particular transaction. [*158*] If a man stands as a guarantor for the appearance (of a debtor) and does not produce him here, he must pay the debt out of his own property. [*159*] A son does not have to pay (his father's debts contracted) through acting as a guarantor or by

making useless gifts, nor gambling debts, bar bills, or the unpaid remainder of a fine or a tax. [*160*] The rule set forth above should apply to a guarantor for the appearance (of a debtor), but if a man who stands as a guarantor for payment dies, (the king) may even make his heirs pay the debt. [*161*] For what reason, then, may a man who has lent money try to recover the debt after the death of a guarantor who did not pay and whose disposition (in this matter) was well known? [*162*] If the guarantor had received money and had enough, then (his heir) who receives it (in turn) should pay the debt out of his own money; this is a fixed rule.

[*163*] A contract is not valid when it is made by an unauthorized person or by someone drunk, crazy, in pain, or totally dependent, or a child, or an old man. [*164*] A verbal agreement does not become binding, even when it is well supported, if what is said is outside the bounds of justice and outside of customary business practices. [*165*] (The king) should make entirely void anything pledged or sold by fraud, anything given or received by fraud, or (any transaction) in which he detects circumvention. [*166*] If a debtor dies and the money was spent for the benefit of his immediate family, his relatives should pay the debt from their own property, even if they are (now) dispersed. [*167*] If even someone totally dependent makes a contract for the benefit of his immediate family, his superior should not rescind it, whether he is living at home or travelling away from home. [*168*] What is given by force, enjoyed by force, and also what is written by force, indeed all matters that are done by force Manu has declared to be undone.

[*169*] Three suffer for the sake of someone else: the witnesses, the guarantor, and the family; and four amass a pile (of money at the expense of someone else): a priest, a rich man, a merchant, and a king. [*170*] A king, even if he is insolvent, should not take what should not be taken, nor, even if he is rich, should he reject even a tiny thing that should be accepted. [*171*] As a result of taking what should not be taken, and rejecting what should be accepted, a king gets a reputation for weakness and is destroyed here on earth and after death. [*172*] But as a result of taking what is his and protecting the weak from the confusion of castes, the king's power springs forth and he thrives here on earth and after death. [*173*] Therefore the ruler should disregard his own likes and dislikes, just like Yama, and he should behave like Yama, conquering his anger and his sensory powers. [*174*] His enemies soon get control over the evil-hearted king who is so deluded as to try legal cases unjustly. [*175*] But if he restrains his desire and anger and tries legal cases justly, his subjects run after him as rivers run to the ocean.

[*176*] If a man accuses a creditor before the king of recovering his

debt in a manner of his own choosing, the king should make him pay the money to (the creditor) and fine him a quarter of the debt. [*177*] A debtor, if he is of the same class or of a lower class than his creditor, may pay off his debt to him even by physical labour; but if he is of a higher class, he should pay it off gradually. [*178*] The king should make an equitable decision according to these rules between men disputing legal cases that are proven by witnesses and evidence.

[*179*] An intelligent man will make a deposit with an Aryan of good family and good conduct, who understands the law and speaks the truth, has a large following, and is wealthy. [*180*] A man should take back his deposit in the same condition in which he deposited it in the other man's hands; as the giving, so the receiving. [*181*] If a man does not give back a deposit when it is requested by the depositor, the interrogating judge may ask him for it in the depositor's absence. [*182*] If there is no witness, (the judge) himself should actually make a deposit of gold with the man, under some pretext and through the mediation of secret agents of the right age and appearance, [*183*] and if he returns it in the same manner and form that it had when it was deposited, then nothing for which others have brought proceedings against him is found in him. [*184*] But if he does not give that gold back to them in accordance with the rules, then he should be forced to pay back both (deposits); this is an established rule of justice.

[*185*] Neither a deposit nor something loaned for personal use should ever be returned to the nearest relative (of the depositor), for if a calamity occurs (to that relative), both (deposit and loan) are lost, though if there is no calamity they are not lost. [*186*] But if (the depositary) of his own will returns (the deposit) to the nearest relative of the (depositor) after his death, neither the king nor the depositor's relatives should bring proceedings against him. [*187*] And he should try to get the object not by a trick but in a friendly and pleasant manner, or else he should investigate the (depositary's) conduct and achieve his purposes by gentle persuasion. [*188*] This rule applies to the attempt to get back all those deposits; but nothing should be held against (the depositary of) a sealed deposit, if he has not taken anything out of it. [*189*] (The depositary) need not give back a deposit that has been stolen by thieves, washed away by water, or burnt by fire, if he has not taken anything out of it.

[*190*] If a man takes away a deposit or is not a depositor (and claims the deposit), (the king) should investigate him by all (sorts of means) and by Vedic oaths. [*191*] Both a man who does not return a deposit and one who asks for it when he has not deposited it should be punished like thieves or made to pay a fine equal (to the value of the deposit). [*192*] If a man takes away a deposit or keeps something loaned for personal use, the king should make him pay a fine equal (to

the value of the deposit), without distinction. [*193*] Any man who takes away another man's property through circumvention should be publicly struck down by various sorts of corporal or capital punishments, together with his accomplices. [*194*] If someone makes a deposit of a certain measurement and value in the presence of the family, it should be recognized as being of that measurement and value, and anyone who says otherwise deserves to be punished. [*195*] But a deposit that has been privately delivered and received should be privately returned; as the giving, so the receiving. [*196*] The king should thus make his decision about a deposit of money and something loaned in a friendly way for personal use, without bankrupting the man who holds the deposit.

[*197*] If anyone sells the property of another man when he is not the owner and has not been given permission by the owner, (the king) should not use him as a witness, for he is a thief even though he may not regard himself as a thief. [*198*] If he is connected (with the owner), he should be made to pay a fine of six hundred (pennies); if he is not connected, and has no excuse, he would be guilty of theft. [*199*] But if anything is given or sold by someone who does not own it, it should be regarded as if it had not been done, according to the fixed rule in legal proceedings. [*200*] If a man is seen to be making use of something, but no title at all is to be seen, then the title is the proof (of ownership), not the use; this is a fixed rule. [*201*] If a man gets any piece of property by a sale in the presence of his family, he gets that property clearly and legally by purchase. [*202*] If the original (man who sold it but did not own it) cannot be produced, but (the buyer) is cleared by the public sale, he should be released by the king and not punished, but the (true owner) who lost the property should get it back.

[*203*] One thing mixed with another should not be sold, nor anything that is spoiled, deficient, far away, or concealed. [*204*] If one girl is shown but another is given to the bridegroom, he may marry both of them for the single bride-price; that is what Manu says. [*205*] If a girl is crazy or leprous or has lost her virginity, and the man who gives her in marriage announces her flaws ahead of time, he does not deserve to be punished.

[*206*] If an officiating priest chosen for a sacrifice abandons his own work, those who work with him should give him only a share (of the sacrificial gift) in proportion to the work he has done. [*207*] But if he abandons his own work after the sacrificial gifts have been given to the officiating priests, he should receive his entire share and have someone else do (the rest of his work). [*208*] If individual sacrificial gifts have been declared for each part of a ceremony, only he (who carries out that part) should receive them or they should all share (all

the gifts). [*209*] (If each takes his own part,) the sacrificing priest should take the chariot, and the overseer priest who serves at the kindling of the fire (should take) the horse, the priest of the oblation should also take a horse, and the cantor the cart used for the purchase (of Soma). [*210*] Among them all, the chief priests, who are entitled to a half, should have half (the sacrificial gifts); the next group should have half of that half, the group entitled to a third should have a third, and the group entitled to a fourth should have a quarter. [*211*] The distribution of shares here among men who, together, do each his own work should be carried out by the application of this rule.

[*212*] If someone should ask someone else for, and be promised, money to be used for the sake of religion, but afterwards it is not so, it should not be given to him. [*213*] But if out of pride or greed he tries to get it back, the king should make him pay one gold piece as redemption for his theft.

[*214*] The non-payment of what has been promised, in accordance with law, has thus been properly described; after that I will explain the non-payment of wages.

[*215*] If, out of pride, a hired servant who is not in pain does not do his work as agreed, he should be fined eight 'berries', and no wages should be paid to him. [*216*] But if he has been in pain and, when he is sound again, does (the work) as it was agreed at the beginning, he should get all his wages, even after a long time. [*217*] If, however, he does not get his work done as agreed, his wages should not be paid to him whether he is in pain or sound, even if the work lacks only a little to be complete.

[*218*] The law for the non-payment of wages for work has thus been entirely described; after that I will explain the law for breach of contract.

[*219*] If a man enters into a sworn agreement with a group from a village or district and then breaks it out of greed, (the king) should banish him from the kingdom. [*220*] He should arrest a man who violates an agreement and make him pay a fine of four 'gold coins', six 'gold ornaments', and a silver 'hundred-weight'. [*221*] A just king should apply this rule of punishment to those who violate agreements with village or caste communities. [*222*] If someone buys or sells anything and then regrets (what he did), he should give the article back or take it back within ten days. [*223*] But after ten days he may not give it back or have it given back; the king should impose a fine of six hundred (pennies) on anyone who takes it or gives it back.

[*224*] The king himself should impose a fine of ninety-six (pennies) on anyone who gives a flawed girl in marriage without announcing the flaw. [*225*] But if a man, out of hatred, says of a virgin, 'She is not

a virgin,' but cannot show her flaw, he should be fined a hundred (pennies). [*226*] The Vedic verses for the wedding ceremony of joining hands are established only for virgins, and nowhere among men for those who are not virgins, for such women are deprived of the religious rites. [*227*] The Vedic verses for the wedding ceremony of joining hands are the sure mark of a (legitimate) wife; but wise men should know that they are sealed in the seventh step. [*228*] If anyone here feels regret about any completed business whatever, (the king) should set him on the path of justice by this rule.

[*229*] I will explain, properly and in accordance with justice and accuracy, the disputes about the transgressions of herdsmen and the owners of livestock.

[*230*] The herdsman has the responsibility for maintaining the safety (of the livestock) by day, and the owner at night, if they are in his house, but if (they are) not, the herdsman is responsible (at night, too). [*231*] A hired cowherd who is paid in milk may, with the consent of the owner, milk the best of ten (cows); this should be the pay for a herdsman who is not paid (in any other way). [*232*] The herdsman alone should pay for (any animal that has been) lost, destroyed by worms, killed by dogs, or that has fallen dead on uneven ground, all fór lack of manly effort. [*233*] But the herdsman should not pay for (an animal) stolen by thieves despite his shouts, as long as he reports it to his own master at the (proper) time and place. [*234*] If livestock die, he should give their masters their two ears, skin, tail, bladder, sinews, and yellow bile, and he should show the significant marks. [*235*] And if goats and sheep are surrounded by wolves and the herdsman does not drive them away, the herdsman is guilty for whatever (animals) a wolf may attack and kill. [*236*] But if, when they are herded together and grazing together in a forest, a wolf springs upon one of them and kills it, the herdsman is not guilty for that.

[*237*] All around a village there should be a reserved area of one hundred bow-lengths or three casts of a stick, and three times that for a city. [*238*] If livestock damage unfenced crops in that area, the king should not have the herdsmen punished for that. [*239*] (The owner of a field) in that area should make a hedge that a camel could not look over and close up any gap that a dog or a pig could put his muzzle or snout through. [*240*] (If livestock damage crops) in an enclosed field by a road or near a village, the herdsmen should be fined a hundred (pennies), and (the owner of the field) should round up livestock that have no herdsman. [*241*] An animal that gets into someone else's fields incurs a fine of one penny and a quarter, and in all cases (the value of) the crop must be paid to the owner of the field; this is the established rule. [*242*] But Manu has said that no fine is incurred for

(damage done by) a cow who has calved within ten days, by bulls, or by the livestock of the gods, whether they have a herdsman or have no herdsman. [*243*] If the owner of a field has caused serious harm, the fine should be ten times the portion (damaged); but the fine should be only half of that if the harm was caused by hired servants and the owner of the field did not know about it. [*244*] A just king should enforce this set of rules whenever there is a transgression by livestock or by their owners or herdsmen.

[*245*] If a dispute about a boundary has arisen between two villages, (the king) should determine the boundary in May or June, when the ridges of earth that divide the fields are clearly visible. [*246*] He should make boundary trees of banyan trees, fig trees, 'pseudo-parrot' trees, silk-cotton trees, Sal trees, Palmyra palms, and trees with milky sap, [*247*] thickets, various sorts of bamboos, fire-stick trees, mounds of earth with vines, reeds, and thickets of hump-back plants; in this way the boundary will not disappear. [*248*] Ponds, wells, long ponds, and fountains, as well as temples, should be made where boundaries meet. [*249*] And one should have other, hidden signs of boundaries made, considering the reversals that constantly occur in the world through men's ignorance of boundaries. [*250*] Stones, bones, the hair of cows' tails, husks, ashes, potsherds, dry cowdung, bricks, cinders, pebbles, sand, [*251*] and whatever things of this sort the earth does not corrode in time, he should have these put down and hidden where boundaries meet. [*252*] By these signs, by uninterrupted previous use, or by the bed cut by flowing water the king should determine the boundary between two disputing parties.

[*253*] If some doubt remains even when the signs are visible, the settlement of a boundary dispute depends upon the proof given by witnesses. [*254*] The witnesses about the boundary should be questioned about the signs of the boundary in the presence of the village families and the two disputing parties. [*255*] (The king) should fix the boundary in place according to the decision about the boundary that the witnesses give unanimously when they are questioned, and he should make a record of all their names. [*256*] They should put earth on their heads and wear garlands and red clothes, and when each of them has sworn an oath by his own good deeds, they should determine (the boundary) correctly. [*257*] If they determine it in the manner described, they are purified as witnesses of the truth; but if they determine it in a manner contrary (to the truth), they should be fined two hundred (pennies).

[*258*] If there are no witnesses, (neighbours from) the four bordering villages, having been purified, should determine the boundary in the presence of the king. [*259*] If there are no original inhabitants of the neighbouring villages to serve as witnesses for the

boundary, (the king) may call (as a witness) even the following men who frequent the forests: [*260*] hunters, bird-catchers, cowherds, fishermen, men who dig roots, snake-catchers, a man who lives by gleaning (corn) and gathering (single grains), and other men who move about in the forest. [*261*] As they, when they are questioned, describe the mark where the boundaries meet, the king should in justice establish it between the two villages just like that. [*262*] The decision about the boundary ridges of a field, a well, a pond, a garden or a house that depends upon the proof given by the neighbours should be recognized. [*263*] If the neighbours lie about a boundary ridge that men are disputing, the king should make each of them individually pay the middle-level fine. [*264*] If a man takes away a house, pond, garden, or field by threatening (the owner), he should be fined five hundred (pennies); but if he did it through ignorance, the fine is two hundred (pennies). [*265*] If the boundary cannot be established, the king himself, alone, knowing justice, should assign the land to them as a kindness; this is a fixed rule.

[*266*] The law for boundary settlements has thus been described in its entirety; after this I will tell (the law) for deciding cases of verbal assault.

[*267*] A ruler who shouts abuse at a priest should be fined a hundred (pennies); a commoner (who does this), a hundred and fifty or two hundred (pennies); a servant (should be given) corporal or capital punishment. [*268*] A priest who defames a ruler should be fined fifty (pennies); for a commoner, the fine is a half of fifty (pennies); and for a servant, twelve (pennies). [*269*] A twice-born man who transgresses against a man of the same class (should be fined) two hundred (pennies); but the fine should be double that for words that should not be said. [*270*] If a man of one birth hurls cruel words at one of the twice-born, his tongue should be cut out, for he was born from the rear-end. [*271*] If he mentions their name or caste maliciously, a red-hot iron nail ten-fingers long should be thrust into his mouth. [*272*] If he is so proud as to instruct priests about their duty, the king should have hot oil poured into his mouth and ears. [*273*] If in his pride he tells lies about (their) knowledge of the revealed canon, their district, their caste, or the ritual perfection of their bodies, he should be made to pay a fine of two hundred (pennies).

[*274*] A man who calls another man one-eyed, lame, or something else like that, even if it is true, should be made to pay a fine of at least one 'scratch-penny'. [*275*] If a man calumniates his mother, father, wife, brother, son, or teacher, or does not yield the right of way to his guru, he should be fined a hundred (pennies). [*276*] If a priest and a ruler (calumniate one another), a discerning (king) should impose the

lowest-level fine upon the priest and the middle-level fine upon the ruler. [*277*] If a commoner and a servant (calumniate one another), punishment should actually be applied to them in the very same way, according to their respective castes, except that the tongue should not be cut out.

[*278*] The rule for the punishment of verbal assault has thus been accurately described; after this I will explain the decision (in cases) of physical assault.

[*279*] If a man of the lowest caste injures a man of a higher caste with some particular part of his body, that very part of his body should be cut off; this is Manu's instruction. [*280*] If a man raises his hand or a stick, he should have his hand cut off; if in anger he strikes with his foot, he should have his foot cut off. [*281*] If a man of inferior caste tries to sit down on the same seat as a man of superior caste, he should be branded on the hip and banished, or have his buttocks cut off. [*282*] If in his pride he spits on him, the king should have his two lips cut off; if he urinates on him, the penis; if he farts at him, the anus. [*283*] If he grabs him by the hair, or by the feet, the beard, the neck, or the testicles, (the king) should unhesitatingly have his hands cut off. [*284*] If he breaks his skin or sheds his blood he should be fined a hundred (pennies); if he tears the flesh, (he should be fined) six 'gold ornaments', and if he breaks a bone he should be banished.

[*285*] For injuring all kinds of trees, a fine should be imposed in proportion to their usefulness; that is the established rule. [*286*] (The king) should impose a fine in direct proportion to the amount of pain caused when someone strikes men or animals to give them pain. [*287*] When a part of the body has been injured, a wound inflicted, or blood shed, (the assailant) must pay (the victim) what it costs to restore him to health, or he may pay the whole (cost to the king) as a fine.

[*288*] If a man knowingly or unknowingly injures another man's property, he must give the man full satisfaction and pay an equal amount to the king. [*289*] But (for damaging) leather, utensils made of leather, wood or clay, or flowers, roots, and fruits, the fine should be five times their value.

[*290*] They say, there are ten instances of pardonable offences committed by a carriage, its driver, and its owner; in all other instances there is a fine. [*291*] When the nose-strap is cut or the yoke broken, when the carriage slips sideways or back, when the axle or a wheel is broken, [*292*] when the traces, the thongs attaching the animal to the carriage-pole, or the reins are broken, or when (the driver) has shouted, 'Get out of the way!', Manu says there should be no fine. [*293*] But if the carriage veers off the road through the

driver's lack of skill, and there are injuries, the owner should be fined two hundred (pennies). [*294*] If the driver is capable (of stopping), the driver should be fined; but if the driver is not capable, all the people in the carriage should be fined a hundred (pennies) apiece. [*295*] But if he is held up on the road by livestock or by a chariot and causes the death of a creature with the breath of life, a fine should be imposed for that without hesitation. [*296*] If a man is killed, (the driver's) offence will immediately be that of a thief; if a large creature with the breath of life, such as a cow, an elephant, a camel, or a horse, (is killed, his offence is) half of that. [*297*] For injuring small livestock, the fine should be two hundred (pennies); but for auspicious wild animals or birds, the fine should be fifty (pennies). [*298*] For donkeys, sheep, and goats, the fine should be five 'small beans'; but for killing a dog or a pig, the fine should be one 'small bean'.

[*299*] If a wife, a son, a slave, a menial servant, or a full brother has committed an offence, they may be beaten with a rope or with a split bamboo cane, [*300*] but only on the back of the body, and never on the head; anyone who beats them anywhere else will incur the guilt of a thief.

[*301*] The decision (in cases of) physical assault has thus been described in its entirety; now I will explain the rule for deciding the punishment for theft.

[*302*] The king should make the utmost effort to suppress thieves, for his fame and kingdom thrive on the suppression of thieves. [*303*] The king who gives safety is constantly revered; for the extended sacrifice that he performs, in which safety is the sacrificial gift, always thrives.

[*304*] A king who protects (his subjects) gets a sixth part of everyone's religious merit, but if he does not protect them he gets a sixth part of their irreligious demerit, too. [*305*] Whatever (religious merit is gained when a subject) studies the Veda, sacrifices, gives gifts, or worships, the king enjoys a sixth part of that as a result of protecting (his subjects) properly. [*306*] A king who protects living beings justly and puts to death those who should be killed is virtually sacrificing every day with sacrifices in which hundreds of thousands are given as sacrificial gifts. [*307*] If a king who does not protect collects taxes on crops, land taxes, tolls and duties, daily gifts, and fines, he soon goes to hell. [*308*] They say that a king who does not protect but takes the sixth part of the crop in taxes takes on himself the entire defilement of all his people. [*309*] Know that a king who disregards the moral boundaries, who is an atheist and plunders the property of priests, who does not protect (his subjects) but eats them, sinks down.

[*310*] He should energetically restrain the irreligious by three means: imprisonment, chains, and various kinds of corporal and capital punishment. [*311*] For kings are constantly purified by restraining the wicked and being kind to the virtuous, just as the twice-born (are purified) by sacrifices. [*312*] A king who wishes to do what is good for him will always forgive men who insult him, if they are parties to legal disputes, children, old or ill. [*313*] If (a king) who is insulted by people in distress tolerates it, he is exalted in heaven as a result, but if his royal power makes him unable to endure it, he goes to hell as a result.

[*314*] A thief should run up to the king with his hair unbound, announce his theft, and say, 'This is the result of what I have done; punish me,' [*315*] carrying a club on his shoulder, or a stick made of acacia wood, or a spear sharpened at both ends, or an iron rod. [*316*] The thief is released from his theft whether he is punished or set free, but if the king does not punish him he takes on himself the offence of the thief. [*317*] A man who kills an embryo transfers his offence on to anyone who eats his food; a wife who commits adultery, on to her husband; a pupil or sacrificial patron, on to the guru; and a thief, on to the king. [*318*] But men who have done evil and have been given punishment by kings become free of defilement and go to heaven, just like people who have done good deeds.

[*319*] If a man steals the rope or bucket from a well, or damages a roadside hut where water is kept, he should pay a fine of one 'bean' and put back in its place (what he has taken). [*320*] Corporal or capital punishment (should be inflicted) on a man who steals more than ten 'jars' of grain; for less, he should pay a fine of eleven times (the value of the grain) and give back (the value of) the property to the owner. [*321*] Similarly, corporal or capital punishment (should be inflicted for stealing) more than a hundred of articles that are measurable by weight, gold, silver, and so forth, or of the finest garments. [*322*] For (stealing) more than fifty, his hands should be cut off; for less, he should be made to pay a fine of eleven times the value (of what was stolen). [*323*] For stealing men of good family, and especially women, or the finest gems, (the thief) deserves corporal or capital punishment. [*324*] For the theft of large livestock, weapons, or medicines, the king should devise a punishment taking into consideration the time and the purpose (of the theft). [*325*] For hamstringing cows that belong to priests, or stealing (small) livestock, half of the (thief's) foot should immediately be (cut off).

[*326*] For stealing thread, cotton, agents of fermentation, cowdung, molasses, yogurt, milk, buttermilk, water, grass, [*327*] baskets made of bamboo or split cane, salts, clay, things made of clay, and ashes, [*328*] fish, birds, oil, clarified butter, meat, honey, and other animal

products, [*329*] other things of this sort, wine, cooked rice, or all sorts of cooked foods, the fine should be twice the value of the stolen item. [*330*] For flowers, green grain, shrubs, creepers, and trees, and other unwinnowed (grain), the fine should be five 'berries'. [*331*] For winnowed grain, vegetables, roots, and fruits, the fine should be a hundred (pennies) if there is no connection, but half a hundred (pennies) if there is a connection. [*332*] An act (of this sort) committed by force is an act of violence when there is a connection, but it is theft when there is no connection or when someone takes something away and then denies it. [*333*] If a man steals any of these things when they have been prepared for use, or if he steals fire from a house, the king should have him pay a fine at the lowest level.

[*334*] Whatever part of the body a thief moves against men, that is precisely the part of the body that the king should take away, as a deterrent. [*335*] No father, teacher, friend, mother, wife, brother, son, or personal priest should go unpunished by the king if he fails to remain within his own duty. [*336*] In a case where another, common man would be fined one 'scratch-penny', in that case a king should be fined a thousand; this is the established rule. [*337*] For theft, the offence (and hence the fine) of a servant should be eight times (the value of the stolen object), of a commoner it is sixteen, and of a ruler thirty-two, [*338*] but of a priest it is sixty-four, or a full hundred, or even twice sixty-four times, for he knows about virtues and vices.

[*339*] Manu has said that it is not theft to take roots and fruits from trees, wood in order to make a fire, and grass as fodder to feed to cows. [*340*] A priest who, by sacrificing for him or even teaching him (the Vedas), tries to get property from the hands of a man who took it when it was not given to him, is just like a thief. [*341*] If a twice-born man who is travelling and runs out of provisions takes two sugarcanes or two roots from another man's field, he should not have to pay a fine. [*342*] A man who ties up (animals) that are not tied up, or sets free those that are tied up, or who takes a slave, a horse, or a chariot, commits the offence of a thief. [*343*] A king who suppresses thieves according to this rule will win fame in this world and unsurpassed happiness after death.

[*344*] A king who wishes to win the position of Indra and incorruptible, unfading fame should not, even for a moment, overlook a man of violence. [*345*] A man who commits violence should be regarded as the worst evil-doer, worse than a man who commits verbal assault, a thief, or a man who injures someone with a rod. [*346*] A king who tolerates someone bent on violence quickly goes to his own destruction and incurs hatred. [*347*] Neither as a result of friendship nor for the sake of getting a great deal of money should a king set free men of violence, who cause terror to all living beings.

[348] Twice-born men may take up weapons when their duties are being obstructed and when time has brought calamity down upon the twice-born classes. [349] A man who kills with justice, in self-defence, in a struggle for the sacrificial gifts, or in order to protect women and priests, does nothing wrong. [350] A man may without hesitation kill anyone who attacks him with a weapon in his hand, even if it is his guru, a child, or an old man, or a priest thoroughly versed in the Veda. [351] There is no stain at all for the killer in slaying a man who has a weapon in his hand, whether he does it openly or secretly; rage befalls rage.

[352] If men persist in seeking intimate contact with other men's wives, the king should brand them with punishments that inspire terror and banish them. [353] For that gives rise among people to the confusion of the classes, by means of which irreligion, that cuts away the roots, works for the destruction of everything. [354] If a man who has previously been accused of such offences carries on a private conversation with another man's wife, he should pay the lowest level of fine. [355] But if a man who has not previously been accused speaks to (another man's wife) for a reason, he should incur no fault, for he has committed no transgression. [356] If a man speaks to another man's wife at a bathing place, in a wilderness or a forest, or at the confluence of rivers, he incurs (the guilt of) sexual misconduct. [357] Acting with special courtesy to her, playing around with her, touching her ornaments or clothes, sitting on a couch with her, are all traditionally regarded as sexual misconduct. [358] If a man touches a woman in a non-place, or allows himself to be touched by her, with mutual consent, it is all traditionally regarded as sexual misconduct.

[359] A man who is not a priest deserves to be punished by the loss of his life's breath for sexual misconduct, for the wives of all four classes should always be protected to the utmost. [360] Beggars, panegyrists, men who have been consecrated for a Vedic sacrifice, and workmen may carry on a conversation with other men's wives if they are not prohibited (from doing so). [361] But a man who has been prohibited should not carry on a conversation with other men's wives; if a man who has been prohibited converses (with them), he should pay a fine of one 'gold piece'. [362] This rule does not apply to the wives of strolling actors or of men who live off their own (wives); for these men have their women embrace (other men), concealing themselves while they have them do the act. [363] But just a very small fine should be paid by a man who carries on a conversation secretly with these women, or with menial servant girls who are used by only one man, or with wandering women ascetics.

[364] A man who corrupts an unwilling virgin should instantly suffer corporal or capital punishment; but a man who corrupts a

willing (virgin) when he is her equal should not undergo corporal or capital punishment. [*365*] If a virgin makes love with a man of a superior caste, (the king) should not make her pay any fine at all; but if she makes love with a man of the rear castes, he should have her live at home in confinement. [*366*] If a man of the rear castes makes love with a virgin of the highest caste, he should be given corporal or capital punishment; if he makes love with a virgin of the same caste as his own, he should pay the bride-price, if her father wishes it. [*367*] But if a man in his arrogance overpowers a virgin and does it to her, two of his fingers should immediately be cut off and he should pay a fine of six hundred (pennies). [*368*] If a man corrupts a willing virgin when he is her equal, he should not have his fingers cut off but should be made to pay a fine of two hundred (pennies) in order to put an end to this addiction.

[*369*] If a virgin does it to another virgin, she should be fined two hundred (pennies), be made to pay double (the girl's) bride-price, and receive ten whip (lashes). [*370*] But if a (mature) woman does it to a virgin, her head should be shaved immediately or two of her fingers should be cut off, and she should be made to ride on a donkey.

[*371*] If a woman who is proud of her relatives or her own qualities deceives her husband (with another man), the king should have her eaten by dogs in a place frequented by many people. [*372*] And he should have the evil man burnt on a red-hot iron bed, and people should pile wood on it, and the evil-doer should be burnt up. [*373*] A double fine should be imposed on a man who has already been convicted and is accused (again) within a year, and it should be just as much for cohabiting with a woman outlaw or a 'Fierce' Untouchable woman.

[*374*] A man of the servant class who cohabits with someone of the twice-born castes, guarded or unguarded, loses his (sexual) member and all his property if the person was unguarded, and his entire (body and property) if the person was guarded. [*375*] A commoner (who commits this act) should have all his property confiscated and be imprisoned for a year; a ruler should pay a fine of a thousand (pennies) and have his head shaved with urine. [*376*] If a commoner or a ruler has sex with an unguarded woman of the priestly class, (the king) should make the commoner pay five hundred (pennies) and the ruler a thousand. [*377*] But if these two go astray even with a guarded woman of the priestly class, they should be punished like servants or burnt up in a grass fire. [*378*] A priest who rapes a guarded woman of the priestly class should be fined a thousand pennies, but if he has sex with her when she wants it, he should be fined five hundred (pennies).

[*379*] Shaving the head is ordained as the punishment consist ing in the loss of the life's breath for a priest; but for the other classes the

punishment should be the (actual) loss of the life's breath. [*380*] (The king) should never kill a priest, even one who persists in every sort of evil; he should banish such a man from the kingdom, unhurt and with all his wealth. [*381*] There is no greater (act of) irreligion on earth than priest-killing; therefore the king should not even conceive in his mind of killing that man. [*382*] If a commoner has sex with a guarded woman of the ruling class, or a ruler with a (guarded) woman of the commoner class, they both deserve the punishment for (sex with) an unguarded woman of the priestly class. [*383*] A priest should be fined a thousand (pennies) if he has sex with guarded women of these two classes; and a fine of a thousand (pennies) should be paid by a ruler or a commoner for (sex with) a woman of the servant class. [*384*] For (sex with) an unguarded woman of the ruling class, a commoner should be fined five hundred (pennies), but a ruler may choose either to have his head shaved with urine or to pay the fine. [*385*] A priest who has sex with an unguarded woman of the commoner class or the ruling class or with a woman of the servant class should be fined five hundred (pennies), but a thousand for (sex with) a woman of the lowest castes.

[*386*] The king in whose town there is no thief, no adulterer, no defamer, no man who commits acts of violence or assault and battery – he enjoys the world of Indra. [*387*] The suppression of these five in his own realm gives the king supreme kingship among those who are his equals in birth and fame among people in the whole world.

[*388*] A sacrificial patron who rejects an officiating priest, and an officiating priest who rejects a sacrificial patron, should each be fined one hundred (pennies), provided (each is) uncorrupted and capable of performing the ceremony. [*389*] Neither a mother nor a father, nor a wife, nor a son deserves desertion; anyone who deserts them when they have not fallen should be fined six hundred (pennies) by the king.

[*390*] When twice-born men argue among themselves about what is to be done in the stages of life, a king who wishes to do what is best for himself should not speak inappropriately about duties. [*391*] Together with the priests, the king should show them due honour, calm them down with conciliation at the start, and then teach them their individual duties.

[*392*] A twice-born man who holds a celebration for twenty (priests) where he does not entertain his immediate neighbour and the neighbour next to that one, if they are good men, should pay a fine of one 'small bean'. [*393*] If a priest who knows his Veda by heart fails to entertain at auspicious ceremonies another virtuous priest who knows his Veda by heart, he should pay him twice the value of the food and pay a fine (to the king) of one gold 'small bean'. [*394*] A blind man,

an idiot, a (cripple) who slides along on a board, a seventy-year-old man, and a man who does favours for priests who know their Veda by heart should not be made to pay taxes to any (king). [*395*] The king should always treat with great respect a priest who knows his Veda by heart, a man who is ill or in pain, a child or an old man, a man who has nothing at all, a man who belongs to a great family, and a noble Aryan.

[*396*] The washerman should wash things gently, on a smooth board made of the wood of a silk-cotton tree, and he should not return (one person's) clothes in place of (another person's) clothes, nor let anyone (other than the owner) wear the clothes. [*397*] A weaver should give back an extra 'straw' (of thread or cloth) for every ten 'straws' (that he receives); if he does otherwise, he should be fined twelve.

[*398*] The king should take one-twentieth of the amount that is established as the fair price by men who are skilled at setting tolls and duties and familiar with all kinds of merchandise. [*399*] The king should take away the entire stock of a man who, out of greed, exports goods that are pre-empted by the king's (monopoly) or forbidden (to be exported). [*400*] A man who avoids a custom-house, or who buys and sells at the wrong time, or lies in counting out (goods or money), should be fined eight times the amount he cheated about. [*401*] (The king) should establish (the rates for) buying and selling all merchandise, taking into consideration the place they leave, the place where they arrive, the (length and time of) storage, and the profit and loss. [*402*] Every five nights, or at the end of every fortnight, the king should establish the prices in the presence of those (merchants). [*403*] Every scale and precise measure should be carefully marked and he should have them examined again every six months.

[*404*] At a ferry, an (empty) cart should be charged one penny, a man's (load) half a penny, a livestock animal or a woman a quarter (of a penny), and a man with no load half a quarter. [*405*] Carts full of goods should be charged a ferry-toll according to their value, but (carts) empty of goods and men with no baggage (should be charged just) a little something. [*406*] For a long journey, the boat-toll should be in proportion to the time (of the journey) and the place (of destination) – but it should be understood that this is just for (journeys) along the banks of rivers; there is no definite rule for (journeys) on the ocean.

[*407*] A woman pregnant two months or more, a wandering ascetic, a hermit, and priests who bear the signs (of their orders) should not be made to pay a toll at a ferry. [*408*] If anything is broken on a boat through the fault of the boatmen, it should be paid for by the boatmen collectively, (each paying) his own share. [*409*] This is the decision

that applies to legal proceedings brought by boat passengers when the boatmen are at fault on the water; there is no fine for (an accident that is) an act of the gods.

[*410*] (The king) should make a commoner engage in trade, lend money, farm the land, or keep livestock; and (he should make) the servant the slave of the twice-born. [*411*] A priest should out of mercy support both a ruler and a commoner if they are starved for a livelihood, and have them carry out their own innate activities. [*412*] But if a priest, out of greed and a sense of power, makes twice-born men who have undergone the transformative rituals do the work of slaves against their will, the king should make him pay a fine of six hundred (pennies). [*413*] He may, however, make a servant do the work of a slave, whether he is bought or not bought; for the Self-existent one created him to be the slave of the priest. [*414*] Even if he is set free by his master, a servant is not set free from slavery; for since that is innate in him, who can take it from him?

[*415*] There are seven ways that slaves come into being: taken under a flag (of war), becoming a slave in order to eat food, born in the house, bought, given, inherited from ancestors, or enslaved as a punishment. [*416*] A wife, a son, and a slave: these three are traditionally said to have no property; whatever property they acquire belongs to the man to whom they belong. [*417*] A priest may with confidence take away any possession from a servant; for since nothing at all can belong to him as his own, his property can be taken away by his master. [*418*] (The king) should make the commoner and the servant carry out their own innate activities diligently; for if the two of them should slip from their own innate activities, they would shake this universe into chaos.

[*419*] Every day, (the king) should see to the completion of his actions, his vehicles and harness animals, his regulated revenues and expenditures, and his mines and his treasury.

[*420*] A king who brings all these legal proceedings to a conclusion in this way and removes every offence reaches the ultimate level of existence.

End of Chapter 8

[2] As in 2.193, the right hand, more precisely the right arm, is kept outside the upper garment.

[4] In modern legal terminology, the third and fifth are conversion.

[7] ‘Here’ may mean in this world or in this text.

[11] This may be an allusion to the four faces of the god Brahmā.

[16] The rather awkward pun forces a meaning from *alam* (‘enough of this, no more of this’) and also, according to some commentators, from *vṛṣala*, which they take to refer not to a particular class but to anyone who gives false evidence.

[17] At 4.239–41, *dharma* (there translated as 'religion') alone is said to follow a man beyond the grave.

[18] The injustice (*adharma*) in this case is an unjust decision; the 'one who causes it' is the plaintiff or defendant who has given wrong testimony, the witness is a false witness, and the judges and the king have failed to detect the falsehood. See 1.81–2 for the diminution of *dharma* (translated in 8.18 as 'justice' and in 1.81–2 as 'religion') quarter by quarter (*pāda* by *pāda*, also meaning 'foot by foot').

[19] Here 'the one who did it' is the one who committed the crime.

[20] The first man is one who was born a priest but did not study the Vedas or perform rituals; the second might not even have been born a priest at all.

[24] One commentator glosses 'profitable and not profitable' as what will please the people and what will make them angry. But there is also a more basic statement about the importance of two of the three human aims (the *trivarga*): profit (*artha*) and religion or justice (*dharma*).

[28] The commentators suggest that the women who have no families (*niṣkulās*) are whores or maidens who have no one to give them in marriage, and that the faithful wives (*pativratās*) are those whose husbands are absent. In all cases, the understanding is that the king takes the place of the absent male protector.

[33] Some commentators suggest that the king may take a twelfth in the first year, a tenth in the second, and a sixth in the third; others that it depends on the virtues or lack of virtues of the owner; one suggests that the proportion depends on the trouble that the king had in protecting it.

[34] They would be trampled to death by the elephant.

[37] The implication is that he leaves no remainder (śeṣa) for the king.

[39] That is, he is overlord of the earth and also the owner of the soil, both of which are designated by the same Sanskrit word (*bhūmi*).

[42] 'One's own particular innate activity' (*svakarman*) is used here as a rough equivalent of *svadharma*, the particular religious duty appropriate to a particular person.

[43] The word *artha* here may mean either a legal case or money, yielding a second meaning of 'swallow up the money'.

[44] Inference (*anumāna*) is one of the three means of arriving at a conclusion; see 12.105.

[45] The time and place may be that of the court case (taking into consideration the customs of the locality and of the period) or of the circumstance of the crime.

[49] 'The usual custom' (*ācarita*, customary conduct) is, according to various commentaries, fasting, fasting to death, sitting at the debtor's door, or killing the debtor's wife, children, and livestock and then sitting at his door.

[51] The legal instrument (*karaṇa*) is an agreement, written or, more often, verbal, that has been witnessed and has legal standing.

[62] 'Men with ancient roots', particularly in that part of the country. The conditions of being in extremity are described at 8.69.

[64] According to the commentators, 'people whose mistakes have been revealed' are those who have previously been convicted of perjury, or of any crime; people who are suffering from diseases are the seriously ill, such as lepers, who may give false testimony as the result of anger, forgetfulness, or faintness; and the corrupt are those who have committed major crimes.

[65] Most of these are excluded because of their inadequacy; the king and the learned priest, however, are excluded because they are needed in other capacities, the king to reign and the priest to attend to his studies and his sacrifices.

[66] The entirely dependent man is probably a slave, but might be a man dependent on a party to the lawsuit. The wrong activities are those of someone of another class.

[68] 'Like them' in class, particularly, but also in other qualities.

[72] The verb used for careful scrutinization (*parīkṣeta*) is, significantly, the same as the one used for the investigation of guests invited to a ceremony for the dead (3.130).

[78] The commentators suggest several reasons for testifying 'other than' naturally (*svabhāvena*): with the thought, 'My words will burn this man who is already burning,' or as a joke, or in anger, or in remorse, or out of fear.

[81] The Goddess of Speech (Sarasvatī) is the wife of the god Brahmā.

[82] Varuṇa, the god of truth, binds liars on earth with ropes made of diseases like dropsy, and in hell with ropes made of serpents.

[84] The self (*ātman*) is both the individual soul or self and the supreme soul or self (*paramātman*) that is identified with *brahman*. The theological implication is that the higher self is witness to the lower self; the more humanistic implication is that a human being is his only witness.

[85] The inner man (*puruṣa*) is the spirit that dwells within all matter. See 1.11, 1.19, etc.

[88] He may warn the commoner that he will lose his own cows, grain, and gold, or that the punishment for giving false evidence is as great as the punishment for stealing cows, grain, and gold or for committing crimes against cows, grain, and gold, or by making him swear by touching a cow, grain, and gold. The warnings to the servant are enumerated in the verses that follow, and this whole set of warnings is repeated at 8.113. The crime (*pātaka*) is, more particularly, a misdeed that causes one to fall (*pat*) from caste. These crimes are enumerated in detail in chapter 11.

[90] Here, and above, it may be assumed that the punishments take place after death, in hell. Cf. 3.230, where a lie sends the merit of the ceremony for the dead to the dogs, presumably dogs on earth. Here, the dogs may be the dogs of Yama.

[91] The commentators identify the hermit (*muni*) with the supreme self (*paramātman*), though Manu identifies him with Yama in the very next verse.

[92] Arguing with Yama, the god of justice, is tantamount to lying. The Field of the Kurus (Kurukṣetra) is, with the Ganges, one of the great pilgrimage sites.

[94] 'Blind Darkness' (*andhatāmisra*) is the name of one particular hell; see 4.88.

[96] The knowing soul, or 'knower of the field' (*kṣetrajña*), the field being the body, is the conscious principle, identified with the inner Man or supreme soul. The commentators suggest that he might doubt or wonder, 'Will he tell the truth or lie?'

[97] The commentators suggest that he destroys his relatives (his ancestors) by causing them to fall to hell, or to fall from heaven and be reborn as animals.

[105] Sarasvatī is the goddess of speech and the wife of the god Brahmā. See 8.81.

[106] The pumpkin verses (*kūṣmaṇḍas*) are *Vājasaneyī Saṃhitā* 20.14–16 (= *Taittirīya Āraṇyaka* 10.3–5), asking the gods to free the worshipper from sin; the verse to Varuṇa is ṛg *Veda* 1.24.15, asking Varuṇa to free the worshipper from sin and from his binding rope; the verses to the waters (ṛg *Veda* 10.9.1–3) merely ask for strength, and are cited elsewhere in Manu (11.133) as reparation for killing certain small animals; but a verse later in that Vedic hymn (10.9.8) asks the waters to free the worshipper from any falsehood that he has sworn.

[108] One commentator says that such disasters are a sign that the man has given false evidence. See 8.115.

[110] One commentator cites the *Mahābhārata*, where the seven sages swore an oath against the unknown thief (Indra) who had stolen certain lotus filaments (13.94.3–44; 13.95.1–86). He also says that the *Mahābhārata* tells that when Indra had seduced Ahalyā and was cursed (by her husband, Gautama), he swore a multiple oath in fear of the curse, but Indra swears no oath in the extant versions of that text (13.41.1–35), nor in the *Rāmāyaṇā* (1.47–8); indeed, if he did it would be a false oath. The commentator also says that when Sudās the son of Pījavana was king (see 7.41), and Vasistha was accused by Viśvāmitra of having eaten his own one hundred sons and of being an ogre, he stood in the middle of a circle, touched the heads of his wives and

children, and swore an oath: ‘May I die today if I am an ogre.’ In the ṛg *Veda* (7.104.15), Vasiṣṭha swears this oath: ‘May I die today if I am a sorcerer (*yātudhāna*), or if I have burnt up the life of a man; may whoever falsely says that I am a sorcerer lose his ten heroic sons.’ It is probably this story to which the commentary, and Manu himself, refers. But the *Bṛhaddevatā* (6.34), in glossing the Vedic verse, says that Vasiṣṭha was in torment because King Sudās had been cursed to become an ogre and had killed Vasiṣṭha’s one hundred sons.

[113] See the note on 8.88. The ruler and commoner must swear, ‘Let these things bear no fruit for me if...’

[115] If he can stay under water a long time, he is innocent; if he comes right to the surface, he is guilty.

[116] The story is told in the *Pañcaviṃśa (Tāṇḍya) Brāhmaṇa* (14.6.6): Vatsa and Medhātithi were both sons of Kaṇva; Medhātithi reproached Vatsa, saying, ‘You are not a priest; you are the son of a mother who was a servant.’ Vatsa replied, ‘As an ordeal of truth, let us walk through fire, to decide which of the two of us is more of a priest.’ And not even a hair of Vatsa was burned by the fire. The story is also told in the *Jaiminīya Brāhmaṇa* (3.234–6), with some changes. The commentators on Manu 8.116 retell the story in great detail, with major modifications, of which perhaps the most significant is that they refer to the evil brother as ‘the half-brother by a different mother’ (*vaimātreya*), which implicitly validates the very claim that the story is at pains to disprove.

[120] The first, or lowest, level of fines is 250 pennies (*paṇas*), the middle level is 500, and the highest level is 1.,000 (see 8.136 and 138). This being so, the last two fines amount, like the first, to 1,000 pennies. In a vain attempt to make sense of this, several commentators take the ‘first’ (*pūrva*) to refer not to the lowest level but to the first sum mentioned in this verse, i.e. 1,000 pennies. In this case, each of the first three fines amounts to 1,000 pennies, while the last comes to 2,000, which is hardly an improvement.

[125] The ninth ‘place’, property, which, the commentators point out, is to be confiscated if the offence is a minor one, indicates that the list includes all forms of punishment, corporal and financial; *daṇḍa*, after all, often means ‘fine’. The tenth ‘place’, the whole body, signifies capital punishment.

[129] The first punishment is straightforward argument and admonition; the second (literally, saying, ‘Shame, shame!’ [*Dhik! Dhik!*]), is still verbal, but more violent. *Vadha* can mean either corporal punishment (usually by whipping or mutilation) or capital punishment (execution, usually by impalement), an ambiguity that clouds many important passages of Manu.

[132] This is the *trasareṇu*.

[113] The ‘louse-egg’ is a *likṣā*; the ‘black mustard-seed’ a *rājasarṣapa*, and the ‘white mustard-seed’ a *gaurasarṣapa*.

[134] The ‘berry’ measurement (*kṛṣṇala*, also called a *raktika*, the bright red seed of the *guñja* berry, Abrus Precatorius) was the smallest weight in actual use, approximately 1.83 grains, or 0.118 grams. Five ‘berries’ made a ‘bean’ (*māṣa*), sixteen ‘beans’ a ‘gold-piece’ (*suvarṇa*), also called a ‘scratch’ (*karṣa*) or a penny (*paṇa*) (literally, a gambler’s chip). The fines in court were usually counted in pennies (*paṇas*), which, like ‘berries’, were normally of copper but might also be of silver or gold, and varied in value accordingly.

[135] The ‘straw’ (*pala*) thus weighed about 1.33 ounces or 37.76 grams. The ‘straw’, as well as the ‘support’ (*dharaṇa*) and the ‘small bean’ (*māṣaka* or *māṣika*), like the ‘berry’, the ‘bean’, and the penny, might be measurements of gold, silver, or copper.

[136] The ‘old coin’ is a *purāṇa*. The ‘scratch-penny’ (*kārṣāpaṇa*) of copper was worth eighty ‘berries’, or five ‘beans’; of gold, it was worth sixteen ‘beans’, that is, a penny.

[137] The ‘hundred-weight’ (*śatamāna*) is also measured in gold. The ‘gold ornament’ (*niṣka*)

is also said to be worth sixteen 'beans'.

[138] The penny (*paṇa*) is the basic weight of all fines, and is to be understood as the unit intended when none is designated.

[140] In the extant lawbook by Vasistha, this rule occurs at 2.51; the text actually says 'the eightieth part of every hundred', which is 1.25 per cent per month, or fifteen per cent per annum.

[142] A priest pays two per cent per month, and so on.

[144] That is, one must not lend a pledge out against the owner's wish, and if it is lent, the lender must give the owner the interest, and reimburse him if it is damaged while lent out.

[146] The good will here probably refers to the owner's consent.

[152] And, according to the implications of 8.142, that five per cent is just for servants, though some commentators on 8.152 would apply that rate to all four classes.

[153] The interest should be recognized by the law texts or by ordinary practice; the term for compound interest is 'wheel-interest', because it keeps coming around; periodical interest is either interest that increases if the debt is not paid by the due date, or simply monthly interest; forced interest is an illegal rate that the debtor agrees to when he is in trouble; corporal interest is paid by the labour of the debtor or of his pledged animals or slaves.

[154] That is, he should exchange the old instrument of agreement for a new one with a new due-date.

[155] That is, if he cannot produce the interest due, he should turn it into an additional principal in the new agreement, but he must promise to pay it as part of the new debt.

[157] The meaning seems to be that the merchant transporting the goods by sea borrows money to outfit the ship and repays it when the ship comes in and the goods are sold; and normal interest rates need not apply for such transactions.

[159] Useless gifts are variously interpreted by the commentators as gifts promised as a joke, or made to clowns or actors or bards or singers, not for the sake of religion, or a tip or bribe promised by the father and not yet paid. 'Useless' (vṛthā) often means 'for no religious purpose' (see the eating of meat 'for no religious purpose', 5.34–8), and a useless gift is a gift to someone other than a priest. 'Gambling debts' are literally debts related to dice (*ākṣika*), and 'bar bills' debts related to liquor (*saurika*). The word for this particular kind of 'tax' (*śulka*) may also designate a bride-price.

[162] That is, if the guarantor had received from the debtor for whom he stood bail enough money to pay off the debt, but died before he could pay it, and that sum is part of the estate that his son inherits, the son must use it to pay the debt.

[163] As in 8.66, someone totally dependent might be a slave, but in this case also a menial servant or the youngest son.

[164] The support might take the form of a written document, a guarantor, or a witness, the commentaries suggest; an example of such an agreement is the sale of one's wife and children.

[168] 'Undone' (*akṛta*) in this context, as in 8.117, means invalidated.

[169] This appears to be a proverb, whose general meaning, according to the commentators, is that the first three should not be forced to serve in legal cases, and the last four should not force others to participate in them. The family suffers when the undivided relatives have to pay a dead man's debts or a family is ruined by a bad son; the rich man benefits by lending money.

[176] The accuser is punished because the creditor has a right to act in this way; see 8.48–50.

[177] A man of a higher class (the commentators say a priest) should not work off the debt but pay gradually as he gets the money in some other way. See 8.153, where paying off interest by physical labour is forbidden.

[178] The evidence may be provided by inference, by ordeal ('an act of god'), or by an oath.

[180] The condition would mean whether or not it was sealed, whether or not the act of depositing was witnessed, and so forth.

[185] The nearest relative (*pratyanantara*) or next in line to inherit would be a son, brother, or wife. The understanding is that, if the depositor is still alive when the deposit is returned to this relative, and the relative dies, the deposit must be paid back to the depositary (the person with whom it was deposited).

[187] 'He' may be the king or the depositor. The commentators suggest that this verse applies to instances where there is some doubt as to the person with whom the deposit was made. 'Gentle persuasion' (*sāman*) is the same term used for the political stratagem of conciliation (see 7.107).

[190] The means may be those listed in 8.49, or the four basic expedients of government polity (conciliation, bribery, dissension, and physical force), or the use of spies, or beating and imprisonment. The Vedic oaths probably also imply ordeals (see 8.109–16).

[192] The commentators suggest various ways in which this verse differs from the previous verse: they say that the more severe punishments implied in 8.191 (for thieves were mutilated) do not apply to first offenders, to deposits of relatively small amounts, or to priests, and that 8.192 covers these cases. 8.192 also stipulates that there should be no distinction between a deposit and something loaned for personal use, or (according to the commentators who feel that the verse as a whole applies only to first offenders) between men who are of different classes or who have received deposits of greater or lesser value.

[193] The word here translated as 'struck down' (*hantavya*) is, like *vadha* ('corporal or capital punishments'), ambiguous; it may mean a beating or torture or execution. The corporal punishments would include crushing or cutting off his hands, feet, or head, impaling him on a stake, or having him trampled to death by elephants.

[194] That is, if the depositary (or, for that matter, the depositor) says that the object has a different value, and the other members of the family testify against him, he should be fined.

[198] He might be connected by birth, being a relative, or by mutual interest (see 8.331–2). Some commentators suggest that this implies that the owner and the thief are in cahoots in some way, others that they merely reside in the same village. An excuse (literally, a 'way out', *apasara*) would be proof that he had been given the item in question or had bought it openly.

[204] Manu objects strongly to the bride-price at 3.51–4 and 9.93–100, but is willing to discuss its legal aspects for those who insist on indulging in the practice.

[205] Verses 8.224 and 9.73 tell how he is to be punished if he does not admit the flaws.

[207] Either the sacrificer or the priest who receives the fee should pay the substitute, according to different commentators.

[210] The first group are the four priests mentioned in 8.209; there are three other groups, each consisting of four priests. The division is calculated differently by the different commentators, but according to one reasonable division, out of every twenty-five shares, the first group gets twelve, the second six, the third four, and the fourth three.

[212] The religious purpose might be a sacrifice or wedding; if it is not used for this purpose, either the money is promised and then not given, or it is given and then taken back.

[218] The Sanskrit term, *samayabheda*, is more literally 'breaking an agreement'.

[224] See 8.205 for the man who does announce the flaw.

[226] 'Those who are not virgins' are more literally 'non-virgins' (*akanyā*); one commentator, perhaps taking 'among men' into consideration, suggests that this term designates homosexuals.

[227] The wedding couple take seven steps around the fire; after the seventh step has been

made the marriage is complete.

[232] The worms may be snakes or a particular sort of worm that kills cows by entering them through their genitals; the dogs may be jackals or domesticated dogs.

[237] A bow-length is approximately six feet. A fire-stick-cast is the distance that one can throw a short, thick piece of wood used at sacrifices (*śamyā*), approximately two hundred feet. The strip of six hundred feet mentioned in this verse was to be reserved for pasturage.

[241] Though the animal is fined, it may be assumed that the herdsman has to pay the fine.

[242] Cows are regarded as being difficult to manage right after they calve. The livestock of the gods are sacrificial animals or animals that belong to temples.

[243] Since the owner of a field must pay taxes to the king (generally a sixth of the crop), he must pay the king a fine if the crop is diminished through his fault (in allowing livestock to get into it, or in failing to plant or harvest properly).

[245] Between mid-May and mid-June (the Indian month called Jyaiṣṭha), the hot sun burns away the grasses that might otherwise obscure the dikes (*setu*).

[246] The banyan tree (*nyagrodha*) is the Ficus Indica, the fig (*aśvattha*, the tree 'under which horses stand') is the Ficus Religiosus, the 'pseudo-parrot' (*kiṃśuka*) tree is the Butea Frondosa, the silk-cotton tree or Seemul (*śālmali*) is the Bombax Heptaphyllum or Salmalia Malabarica, the Sal (*sāla*) is the Shorea Robusta or Valica Robusta, the Palmyra palm (*tāla*) is the Borassus Flabelliformis, and the tree with milky sap might be the Calatropis Gigantea (*arka*).

[247] The fire-stick tree (*śamī*, used to kindle the fire at a sacrifice) is the Acacia Suma. The hump-backed plant (*kubjaka*) is an aquatic plant, the Trapa Bispinosa.

[255] The commentators argue that 'fix in place' means to set down in writing; this is possible, especially given the reference to the witnesses' names, but still unlikely to have been the custom for village disputes in Manu's time.

[263] The middle-level fine is five hundred pennies. See 8.138.

[268] The commentators interpret this as a series of three fines for a priest who insults a member of each of the other three classes, and this is probably the meaning. But it could also be interpreted as a series of three fines for members of the three other classes who insult a ruler.

[270] The man of one birth has not undergone the initiation that is the second birth; he may be a servant, a man with a high-caste father and low-caste mother, or a man of any class who has failed to undergo initiation. 'From the rear-end' (*jaghanya*) means literally 'from the buttocks' and refers to cosmogonies in which certain human groups are born of that part of the creator; figuratively, it means 'last, lowest, vile'. The low birth of the servant is described at 1.31 and his vile, once-born status at 10.4.

[275] 'Calumniates' (*ākṣārayan*) might mean, according to the commentators, that he accuses them of a major crime or of incest or adultery, or causes dissension among them, or curses them.

[277] That is, this is an exception to the general rule set forth in 8.270.

[281] Some commentators specify that this must be done in such a way that the man does not die.

[296] The thief's punishment is often used as a rough standard for other punishments, but there are various ways of punishing a thief. The commentators suggest that it might be a fine of a thousand pennies, in which case half would be five hundred pennies, or the confiscation of all (or half) of his goods, or capital punishment, in which case half would be the mutilation of certain limbs.

[306] Here, as always, 'puts to death those who should be killed' may also mean 'inflicts corporal punishment on those who deserve corporal punishment'.

[309] 'Down' may imply a downfall in this life or hell after death.

[314] The word for 'what I have done' is *karman*, which also implies the effects of that action;

the hair is unbound as a sign of supplication. At 11.100–101 a thief who has stolen gold is instructed to behave in this way, but in that instance the king produces the rod with which to inflict the punishment, whereas here the thief himself brings the instruments with which he is to be punished.

[320] A 'jar' (*kumbha*) is a measure of grain, variously calculated but usually probably somewhere between three and four bushels.

[321] The commentators disagree as to the meaning of a hundred; it may be a hundred items, but more likely a hundred of some weight (a 'scratch', a 'gold ornament', and so forth).

[325] The word *chūrikā*, a hapax, is glossed by most commentators as 'the nostril of a barren cow', but others say it is a draught ox (pierced by the goad) or the sack carried by a draught ox (pierced by a thief who then removes its contents). If, however, we read *sthūrikā*, as several editions do, and consider that the *sthūra* is the hock, or lower leg of an equine or bovine, the verse makes more sense: cutting the *sthūrikā* is hamstringing, particularly in light of the fact that the appropriate punishment may entail cutting off either half of a foot or half of the thief's feet (i.e. one foot).

[331] The thief might be connected with the person that he robs by birth, by being a relative, or by mutual interest (see 8.198).

[332] The act of violence in this case would be robbery with violence. Some commentators interpret the presence or absence of a connection to imply the presence or absence of a guard, or of the owner of the stolen article, at the scene of the crime.

[336] Since the king can hardly pay the fine to himself, the commentators suggest that he should give it to priests or throw it into the water as a gift to Varuṇa (see 9.245).

[344] The position of Indra is kingship over the gods in heaven, the theoretical goal of every human king. Acts of violence include not only robbery with violence (as in 8.332) but, according to the commentators, rape, arson, tearing up clothing, and destroying property.

[345] The man who injures someone with a rod commits assault and battery.

[348] These are times in which robbers prevent the twice-born from offering sacrifice and fulfilling other duties, or a foreign invasion or a famine causes the classes to intermix, or when the king is dead and people must arm themselves to save their property or someone else's property.

[349] The struggle for sacrificial gifts given to the officiating priests (*dakṣiṇā*) might occur when someone is trying to take away their cows, or in war.

[350] The man who has a weapon in his hand is more literally a man with a drawn bow (*ātatāyin*). The commentators, troubled by the implications of this verse, go to great lengths to narrow down the circumstances under which it applies. But it says what it says.

[351] 'Secretly' might be by poison or magic.

[352] The commentators say that the king should brand such a man by means of spears and tridents and cut off his nose, lips, or penis.

[358] Most commentators regard the 'non-place' as the wrong place on the body ('a place other than the hand,' says one) or a place that should not (be touched); some, however, regard it as a lonely place, such as is described in 8.356.

[359] The word used for the loss of the life's breath (*prāṇānta*) is unambiguous in designating death, unlike the usual *vadha* that can mean either capital or corporal punishment. The commentators argue that the death penalty should apply only to a servant, but the verse says quite simply that any man other than a priest may be killed for sexual misconduct. See 8.379 for the exception made for the priest.

[360] Having a legitimate reason to be in the house, these men may speak only about their business there, unless the husband prohibits this.

[364] He is her equal presumably in caste, but perhaps in other qualities too.

[365] For the rear castes (*jaghanya*), see 8.270. The implication is that the girl takes the active role in seducing the man, and that she should be kept at home until she gets over her infatuation. The verbs used for sexual union in this verse and the next (*bhaj* and *sev*) imply passion, even love, in addition to the physical act.

[366] Here it is the man who initiates the act, and so it is he who is punished, but only by being made to marry the girl and to pay the father (if the latter wants to accept the money; if he does not, the man would pay the money as a fine to the king).

[367] The construction is awkward and the use of the verb *kṛ* ('do' or 'make') in this sense is unique to this verse and to 8.369, where its meaning is unmistakable, but the implications are clear enough here too and are spelled out by the commentators: the man does not actually have intercourse with the girl, but corrupts her by opening up her intact vagina with his two fingers, which are therefore appropriately cut off in punishment.

[373] The woman outlaw is a *vrātyā*, whom the commentators identify as the wife of an uninitiated Aryan or even a woman shared by several men. The 'Fierce' Untouchable woman is a *caṇḍālī*. Several commentators suggest that the basic fine is a thousand (pennies) and the double fine therefore two thousand.

[374] A woman of the twice-born classes is almost certainly intended by this verse, but it is worth noting that the 'person' is unspecified, in the unmarked masculine case, which does make it grammatically possible for a man to be intended.

[375] From the context supplied by the preceding and following verses, it may be assumed that this applies to a man who cohabits with a guarded woman of the priestly class. Some commentators say that the urine of a donkey should be used in place of water for this punitive shave, others, the urine of a man or of a dog.

[397] The general meaning seems to be that the weaver should increase, rather than decrease, the weight of a piece that he is given to work on and returns to the owner. Some commentators, however, argue that the weaver should pay the ten per cent as a tax to the king. As for the fine of twelve, some say it is twelve 'straws', some twelve pennies, some twelve times the value of the cloth or the thread, some one-twelfth the value of the cloth or the thread.

[399] The commentators list a few of the king's monopolies: elephants, saffron (in Kashmir), fine cloth (in the east), horses (in the west), gems and pearls (in the south). An example of a prohibited export is grain in time of famine.

[420] The offence that the king removes is that of the offenders whom he rightly punishes as well as his own guilt that he would have if he failed to punish them.

CHAPTER 9

[*1*] I will tell the eternal duties of a man and wife who stay on the path of duty both in union and in separation. [*2*] Men must make their women dependent day and night, and keep under their own control those who are attached to sensory objects. [*3*] Her father guards her in childhood, her husband guards her in youth, and her sons guard her in old age. A woman is not fit for independence. [*4*] A father who does not give her away at the proper time should be blamed, and a husband who does not have sex with her at the proper time should be blamed; and the son who does not guard his mother when her husband is dead should be blamed.

[*5*] Women should especially be guarded against addictions, even trifling ones, for unguarded (women) would bring sorrow upon both families. [*6*] Regarding this as the supreme duty of all the classes, husbands, even weak ones, try to guard their wives. [*7*] For by zealously guarding his wife he guards his own descendants, practices, family, and himself, as well as his own duty. [*8*] The husband enters the wife, becomes an embryo, and is born here on earth. That is why a wife is called a wife (*jāyā*), because he is born (*jāyate*) again in her. [*9*] The wife brings forth a son who is just like the man she makes love with; that is why he should guard his wife zealously, in order to keep his progeny clean.

[*10*] No man is able to guard women entirely by force, but they can be entirely guarded by using these means: [*11*] he should keep her busy amassing and spending money, engaging in purification, attending to her duty, cooking food, and looking after the furniture. [*12*] Women are not guarded when they are confined in a house by men who can be trusted to do their jobs well; but women who guard themselves by themselves are well guarded. [*13*] Drinking, associating with bad people, being separated from their husbands, wandering about, sleeping, and living in other people's houses are the six things that corrupt women. [*14*] Good looks do not matter to them, nor do they care about youth; 'A man!' they say, and enjoy sex with him, whether he is good-looking or ugly. [*15*] By running after men like whores, by their fickle minds, and by their natural lack of affection these women are unfaithful to their husbands even when they are zealously guarded here. [*16*] Knowing that their very own nature is like this, as it was born at the creation by the Lord of Creatures, a man should make the utmost effort to guard them. [*17*] The bed and the seat, jewellery, lust, anger, crookedness, a malicious nature, and bad conduct are what Manu assigned to women. [*18*] There is no ritual with Vedic verses for women; this is a firmly established point of law.

For women, who have no virile strength and no Vedic verses, are falsehood; this is well established.

[*19*] There are many revealed canonical texts to this effect that are sung even in treatises on the meaning of the Vedas, so that women's distinctive traits may be carefully inspected. Now listen to the redemptions for their (errors).

[*20*] 'If my mother has given in to her desire, going astray and violating her vow to her husband, let my father keep that semen away from me.' This is a canonical example. [*21*] If in her mind she thinks of anything that the man that married her would not wish, this is said as a complete reparation for that infidelity.

[*22*] When a woman is joined with a husband in accordance with the rules, she takes on the very same qualities that he has, just like a river flowing down into the ocean. [*23*] When Akṣamālā, who was born of the lowest womb, united with Vasiṣṭha, and Sārangī, the bird-woman, with Mandapāla, they became worthy of honour. [*24*] These and other women of vile birth in this world were pulled up through the particular auspicious qualities of their own husbands.

[*25*] The ordinary life of a husband and wife, which is always auspicious, has thus been described. Now learn the duties regarding progeny, which lead to future happiness both here on earth and after death.

[*26*] There is no difference at all between the goddesses of good fortune (*śriyas*) who live in houses and women (*striyas*) who are the lamps of their houses, worthy of reverence and greatly blessed because of their progeny. [*27*] The wife is the visible form of what holds together the begetting of children, the caring for them when they are born, and the ordinary business of every day. [*28*] Children, the fulfilment of duties, obedience, and the ultimate sexual pleasure depend upon a wife, and so does heaven, for oneself and one's ancestors. [*29*] The woman who is not unfaithful to her husband but restrains her mind-and-heart, speech, and body reaches her husband's worlds (after death), and good people call her a virtuous woman. [*30*] But a woman who is unfaithful to her husband is an object of reproach in this world; (then) she is reborn in the womb of a jackal and is tormented by the diseases (born) of (her) evil.

[*31*] The following discussion about a son was held by good men and great sages born long ago; listen to it, for it has merit and applies to all people.

[*32*] They say that a son belongs to the husband, but the revealed canon is divided in two about who the 'husband' is: some say that he is the begetter, others that he is the one who owns the field. [*33*] The woman is traditionally said to be the field, and the man is

traditionally said to be the seed; all creatures with bodies are born from the union of the field and the seed. [*34*] Sometimes the seed prevails, and sometimes the woman's womb; but the offspring are regarded as best when both are equal. [*35*] Of the seed and the womb, the seed is said to be more important, for the offspring of all living beings are marked by the mark of the seed. [*36*] Whatever sort of seed is sown in a field prepared at the right season, precisely that sort of seed grows in it, manifesting its own particular qualities. [*37*] For this earth is said to be the eternal womb of creatures, but the seed develops none of the qualities of the womb in the things it grows. [*38*] For here on earth when farmers at the right season sow seeds of various forms in the earth, even in one single field, they grow up each according to its own nature. [*39*] Rice, red rice, mung beans, sesame, pulse beans, and barley grow up according to their seed, and so do leeks and sugar-cane. [*40*] It never happens that one seed is sown and another grown; for whatever seed is sown, that is precisely the one that grows.

[*41*] A well-educated man who understands this and who has knowledge and understanding will never sow in another man's wife, if he wants to live a long life. [*42*] People who know the past recite some songs about this sung by the wind god, which say that a man must not sow his seed on another man's property. [*43*] Just as an arrow is wasted if it is shot into the wound of an animal already wounded by another shot, even so seed is immediately wasted on another man's property. [*44*] Those who know the past know that this earth (pṛthivī) is still the wife of Prthu; they say that a field belongs to the man who clears it of timber, and the deer to the man who owns the arrow. [*45*] 'A man is only as much as his wife, himself, and his progeny,' the priests say, and also this: 'The wife is traditionally said to be what the husband is.' [*46*] A wife is not freed from her husband by sale or rejection; we recognize this as the law formulated by the Lord of Creatures long ago. [*47*] The division (of inheritance) is made once, and the daughter is given (in marriage) once, and a man say 'I will give' once; good people do these three things once.

[*48*] Just as the stud is not the one who owns the progeny born in cows, mares, female camels, and slave girls, in buffalo-cows, she-goats, and ewes, so it is too (with progeny born) in other men's wives. [*49*] People who have no field but have seed and sow it in other men's fields are never the ones who get the fruit of the crop that appears. [*50*] If (one man's) bull were to beget a hundred calves in other men's cows, those calves would belong to the owners of the cows, and the bull's seed would be shed in vain. [*51*] In the very same way, men who have no field but sow their seed in other men's fields are acting for the benefit of the men who own the fields, and the man whose

seed it is does not get the fruit.

[*52*] If no agreement about the fruit is made between the owners of the fields and the owners of the seed, it is obvious that the profit belongs to the owners of the fields; the womb is more important than the seed. [*53*] But if this (field) is given over for seeding by means of an agreed contract, then in this case both the owner of the seed and the owner of the field are regarded as (equal) sharers of that (crop). [*54*] Seed that is carried by a flood or a wind into someone's field and grows there belongs to the owner of the field, and the man who sowed the seed does not get the fruit. [*55*] This is the law for the offspring of cows and mares, slave girls, female camels, and she-goats, and birds, and female buffalo.

[*56*] The significance and insignificance of the seed and the womb have thus been proclaimed to you. After that I will explain the law for dealing with women when one is in extremity.

[*57*] The wife of the elder brother is the guru's wife to the younger brother; but the wife of the younger brother is traditionally regarded as the daughter-in-law to the elder brother. [*58*] If, when he is not in extremity, an elder brother has sex with the wife of a younger brother, or a younger brother with the wife of an elder brother, both of them fall even if they have been appointed (to have a child). [*59*] When the line of descendants dies out, a woman who has been properly appointed should get the desired children from a brother-in-law or a co-feeding relative. [*60*] The appointed man, silent and smeared with clarified butter, should beget one son upon the widow in the night, but never a second. [*61*] Some people who know about this approve of a second begetting on (such) women, for they consider the purpose of the appointment of the couple incomplete in terms of duty. [*62*] But when the purpose of the appointment with the widow has been completed in accordance with the rules, the two of them should behave towards one another like a guru and a daughter-in-law. [*63*] If the appointed couple dispense with the rule and behave lustfully, then they both fall as violators of the bed of a daughter-in-law and a guru.

[*64*] Twice-born men should not appoint a widow woman to (have a child with) another man, for when they appoint her to another man they destroy the eternal religion. [*65*] The appointment of widows is never sanctioned in the Vedic verses about marriage, nor is the remarriage of widows mentioned in the marriage rules. [*66*] For learned twice-born men despise this as the way of animals, which was prescribed for humans as well when Vena was ruling the kingdom. [*67*] Formerly, he was a pre-eminent royal sage who enjoyed the whole earth, but his thinking was ruined by lust and he brought about a confusion of the classes. [*68*] Since that time, virtuous men despise any man who is so deluded as to appoint a woman to have children

when her husband has died. [*69*] If the (intended) husband of a girl dies when their promises have been given verbally, her own brother-in-law should take possession of her, according to this rule: [*70*] when she is wearing a white dress and has made an unpolluted vow, he should have sex with her in accordance with the rule, and he should make love with her once during each of her fertile seasons, until there is a child.

[*71*] An intelligent man who has given his daughter to someone should not give her again, for a man who gives and then gives again is lying to someone. [*72*] Even if a man has accepted a girl in accordance with the rules, he may reject her if she is despised, ill, or corrupted, or if she was given with something concealed. [*73*] If anyone gives away a daughter with a flaw and does not mention it, that (gift) from the evil-hearted daughter-giver may be annulled.

[*74*] A man may go away on a journey on business only after he has established a livelihood for his wife; for even a steady woman could be corrupted if she is starving for lack of livelihood. [*75*] If he goes away on a journey after providing a livelihood, she should subject herself to restraints in her life; but if he goes away on a journey without providing for her, she may make her living by crafts that are not disapproved of. [*76*] If the man has gone away on a journey to fulfil some duty, (she) should wait for him for eight years; (if he has gone) for learning or fame, six; for pleasure, three years.

[*77*] A husband should wait for one year for a wife who hates him; but after a year, he should take away her inheritance and not live with her. [*78*] If she transgresses against a husband who is infatuated, a drunk, or ill, he may deprive her of her jewellery and personal property and desert her for three months. [*79*] But if she hates him because he is insane, fallen, impotent, without seed, or suffering from a disease caused by his evil, she should not be deserted or deprived of her inheritance.

[*80*] A wife who drinks wine, behaves dishonestly, or is rebellious, ill, violent, or wasteful of money may be superseded at any time. [*81*] A barren wife may be superseded in the eighth year; one whose children have died, in the tenth; one who bears (only) daughters, in the eleventh; but one who says unpleasant things (may be superseded) immediately. [*82*] But if a woman who is kind and well-behaved becomes ill, she should be superseded (only) when she has been asked for her consent, and she should never be dishonoured. [*83*] And if a woman who has been superseded should leave the house in fury, she should be locked up immediately or deserted in the presence of the family. [*84*] But if she drinks wine at celebrations, even when she has been forbidden, or goes to public spectacles or crowded festivals, she should be punished by a fine of six 'berries'.

[*85*] If twice-born men take women of their own and other (classes), their seniority, reverence, and dwelling place should be (established) according to the order of their class. [*86*] For all husbands, a woman of his own (class), and never a woman of another caste, should care for his body and perform the obligatory daily duties. [*87*] But if man is so deluded as to have this done by a woman other than the one that he has of his own caste, he is just like someone that people in ancient times regarded as a 'Fierce' Untouchable priest.

[*88*] A man should give his daughter, in accordance with the rules, to a distinguished, handsome suitor who is like her, even if she has not reached (the right age). [*89*] But it would be better for a daughter, even after she has reached puberty, to stay in the house until she dies than for him ever to give her to a man who has no good qualities. [*90*] When a girl has reached puberty she should wait for three years, but after that period she should find a husband like her. [*91*] If she herself approaches a husband when she has not been given one, she commits no error, nor does the man whom she approaches. [*92*] A girl who chooses her own bridegroom should not take with her the jewellery given to her by her father, mother, or brothers; if she took that away, she would be a thief.

[*93*] Nor should a man who takes away a girl when she has reached puberty give a bride-price to her father; for (the father) would have neglected his charge over her by impeding (the fulfilment of) her fertile seasons. [*94*] A thirty-year-old man should marry a twelve-year-old girl who charms his heart, and a man of twenty-four an eight-year-old girl; and if duty is threatened, (he should marry) in haste. [*95*] A husband takes his wife as a gift from the gods, not by his own wish; he should always support a virtuous woman, thus pleasing the gods. [*96*] Women were created to bear children, and men to carry on the line; that is why the revealed canon prescribes a joint duty (for a man) together with his wife.

[*97*] If the man who gave the bride-price should die after the bride-price has been given for the girl, the girl should be given to the brother-in-law, if she consents. [*98*] Not even a servant should accept a bride-price when he gives his daughter, for a man who takes a bride-price is covertly selling his daughter. [*99*] Neither in the ancient past nor in recent times did good men ever promise (a girl) to one man and then give her to another; [*100*] nor have we heard that, even in former aeons, a daughter was ever covertly sold for a sum of money that was called a bride-price.

[*101*] 'Let there be mutual absence of infidelity until death'; this should be known as the supreme duty of a man and a woman, in a nutshell. [*102*] A man and woman who have performed the (wedding) ritual should always try not to become separated and unfaithful to one

another.

[*103*] The duty of a man and a woman, which is intimately connected with sexual pleasure, has thus been described to you, as well as the way to obtain children in extremity. Now learn about the division of inheritance.

[*104*] After the father and mother (are dead), the brothers should assemble and divide the paternal estate equally, for they have no power over the two of them while they are alive. [*105*] But the eldest brother may take the paternal property without leaving anything, and the rest live off him as if he were their father. [*106*] As soon as his eldest son is born a man becomes a man with a son, and no longer owes a debt to his ancestors; that is why the (the eldest) deserves to have the whole (estate). [*107*] The son to whom he transfers his debt and by whom he wins eternity is the one born out of duty; people know that the others are born out of desire. [*108*] The eldest brother should support his younger brothers as a father (supports) his sons, and in duty they should also behave like sons to their eldest brother. [*109*] The eldest (brother) makes the family thrive, or else he destroys it; the eldest is most worthy of reverence among people; the eldest is not held in contempt by good men. [*110*] An eldest (brother) who behaves like an eldest (brother) is like a mother, like a father; but if he does not behave like an eldest (brother) he should be revered like a relative.

[*111*] They may live together in this way, or they may live separately if they wish for religious merit; for religious merit increases in separation, and so separate rituals are conducive to religious merit. [*112*] The eldest (son) gets an additional share of one twentieth, as well as the most desirable of all the things, and the middle (son) gets half of that, and the youngest gets a quarter. [*113*] The eldest and the youngest take theirs as has been stated; whatever others there are between the eldest and the youngest get the (same) property as the middle (son).

[*114*] The foremost in birth should receive the foremost of all the various properties, and he should take whatever particular thing is exceptional, and the most desirable of ten (things). [*115*] There is no additional share among ten for (brothers) skilled each in his own work; but some particular thing should be given to the eldest to give him increased honour. [*116*] If the additional share has been taken out in this way, equal portions should be allotted (in what remains); but if the additional share has not been taken out, this is how the portions should be allotted among them: [*117*] the eldest son should take one extra portion, the next in age one and a half, and one share for each of the younger ones. This is the established law. [*118*] And the brothers should individually give their virgin (sisters) something

from their own portions, a quarter share of each one's own portion. If they did not give this, they would fall. [119] The odd goat, sheep, or whole-hooved animal should never be divided up, but the odd goat or sheep should be allotted to the eldest.

[120] If a younger (brother) begets a son on the wife of the elder (brother), there should be an equal division between them. This is the established law. [121] The surrogate does not have the religious merit of the principal; the principal became a father when his son was begotten, and so according to law he should share with him.

[122] If the youngest son (is born) in the first wife, or the first-born son in the youngest wife, and there is uncertainty about how the division should be made between them, [123] the first-born son should take the one (best) bull as his additional share, and then the other, (next-) best bulls (should be given) to those who are inferior to him, according to their mothers. [124] But when the eldest son is born in the eldest wife, he should take fifteen cows and a bull, and after that the remaining (sons) may take their shares according to their mothers; this is the established rule. [125] Between sons born of wives of equal (class), and otherwise undistinguishable, there is no seniority according to their mothers; seniority is said to come from (the order of) one's own birth. [126] It is also traditionally said that the invitation set down in the verses of invocation to Indra (should be spoken) by the eldest-born, and the seniority of two twins in (several) wombs is traditionally said to be according to (the order of) their birth.

[127] A man with no son may make his female child an appointed daughter by means of this formula: 'Whatever children are born in her will offer the refreshment for the dead for me.' [128] In this way in ancient times Daksa himself, a Lord of Creatures, created appointed daughters in order to increase his dynastic line. [129] He gave ten to Dharma, thirteen to Kaśyapa, and twenty-seven to King Soma, with honour and an affectionate heart. [130] A son is just like one's self, and a daughter is equal to a son. How can someone else take (the father's) property when she stands for his self? [131] Whatever separate property the mother has is the share of her daughter alone; if a man dies sonless, his daughter's son alone should take his entire property. [132] For a man's daughter's son should take his entire property if the father has no son, and he must give two balls at the ceremony for the dead, one to his father and one to his mother's father. [133] There is no distinction between a son's son and a daughter's son in worldly matters according to law, for the father (of the one) and the mother (of the other) were born from the (same) body by the (same) man. [134] But if a son is born to a man after he has made his daughter an appointed daughter, the division between

the two of them would be equal; for there is no primogeniture for a woman. [*135*] But if an appointed daughter should somehow die sonless, the husband of that appointed daughter may take her property without hesitation. [*136*] Whether a daughter is appointed or not, the son that she bears to a man of the same (class) makes her father a man who has a grandson, and that (grandson) should give the balls for the dead and take the property.

[*137*] A man wins worlds through a son, and he gains eternity through a grandson, but he reaches the summit of the chestnut horse through the grandson of his son. [*138*] Because the male child saves (*trāyate*) his father from the hell called *put*, therefore he was called a son (*putra*) by the Self-existent one himself. [*139*] There is no distinction between a son's son and a daughter's son in worldly matters, for a daughter's son also saves him in the world beyond, just like a son's son.

[*140*] The son of an appointed daughter should make the offering of the first ball for the dead to his mother, the second one to her father, and the third to her father's father. [*141*] If a man has an adopted son endowed with all good qualities, that (son) should take his estate even if he was brought from (a family of) another lineage (of the sages). [*142*] An adopted son should never take the lineage of the sages and the estate of his natural father; the balls for the dead follow the ritual lineage and the estate, and the refreshment for the dead of the man who gives (his son for adoption) dies out.

[*143*] The son of a woman who has not been appointed and the son fathered by a woman's brother-in-law when she already has a son – neither of these deserves a share, since one is the son of an adulterer and the other the child of lust. [*144*] The man born even in an appointed woman when the rules have not been followed does not deserve the paternal estate, for he was begotten by a fallen man. [*145*] But the son born in an appointed woman should take (his share) in the estate just like a natural son, for according to law, that seed and the offspring belong to the owner of the field. [*146*] A man who maintains the property and the wife of his dead brother should beget a child for his brother and give his property to him alone. [*147*] If a woman who is appointed gets a son born of lust from some other man, or indeed from her brother-in-law, they say that that son is not fit to inherit the estate, and begotten in vain.

[*148*] This should be known as the rule for the division (of inheritance) among sons born in one womb. Now learn (the rule for the division) among (sons) born of one man among many and various wives.

[*149*] If a priest has four wives, this is the traditional rule for the

division among the sons born in them in order (of class): [*150*] the ploughman, the bull for the cows, the wagon, the jewellery, and the house should be given as the additional share to the (son of the woman of the) priestly (class), as well as one principal part. [*151*] The son of the woman of the priestly class should take three parts of the property, the son of the woman of the ruling class two parts, the son of the commoner woman one and a half parts, and the son of the servant woman should take one part. [*152*] Or else a man who knows the law should divide the entire estate in ten and make a just distribution, in the following way: [*153*] the (son of the woman of the) priestly (class) should take four parts, the son of the woman of the ruling class three parts, the son of the commoner woman should take two parts, and the son of the servant woman should take one part. [*154*] If the man has a good son, or even if he does not have a good son, according to law he should not give more than one tenth to his son by a servant woman. [*155*] The son born of a priest, ruler, or commoner father in a servant woman does not (automatically) share in the estate; whatever his father will give him, that precisely will be his property. [*156*] After they have given an additional share to the eldest, all the other sons born of twice-born men in women of the same class should share equally. [*157*] But a wife of his own class, and no other, is prescribed for a servant; all the sons born in her should have equal shares, even if there are a hundred.

[*158*] Manu the son of the Self-existent spoke of twelve sons that men have, of whom six are both relatives and heirs, and six are relatives but not heirs. [*159*] Natural, born in the (husband's) field, adopted, made, secretly begotten, and rejected – these six (sons) are both relatives and heirs. [*160*] Born of an unmarried girl, born of a pregnant bride, bought, born of a remarried woman, self-given, and born of a servant woman – these six (sons) are relatives but not heirs. [*161*] The kind of reward that a man gets when he sets out to cross over water in bad boats is the kind of reward that a man gets when he sets out to cross over the darkness with bad sons. [*162*] If a man has two sons who are heirs to one estate, and one is a natural son while the other was born in the (husband's) field, each one, but not the other, should take the estate of his (natural) father. [*163*] The natural son and he alone is master of his father's wealth, but for the sake of mercy he should give a livelihood to the rest. [*164*] And when the natural son divides up the paternal inheritance, he should give a fifth or a sixth part of his father's property to the son born in the (husband's) field.

[*165*] The natural son and the son born in the (husband's) field (thus) share the father's estate, but the other ten (sorts of sons) share in the lineage (of the sages) and in a part of the estate, in this order:

[*166*] the son that a man begets himself in his own field, in his legally married wife, he should recognize as his natural son, the first in rank. [*167*] The son born in the marriage-bed of a man who is dead, impotent, or diseased, in a woman appointed according to the special law, is traditionally regarded as born in the (husband's) field. [*168*] The son whom the mother or father gives away in extremity, with libations of water, is to be known as the adopted son, if he is affectionate towards and like (the adopting father). [*169*] But the one whom a man makes his son, who is like him, knows the difference between right and wrong, and has the qualities of a son, he is to be recognized as a made son. [*170*] And the one who is begotten in the house when no one knows by whom is the son secretly begotten in the house, and he belongs to the man in whose marriage-bed he was born. [*171*] The one whom a man receives when he has been deserted by his mother and father or by either one of them is called the rejected son.

[*172*] The one that an unmarried girl gives birth to secretly in her father's house is called the son born of an unmarried girl and is said to belong to the man who marries her. [*173*] If a woman who is pregnant gets married, whether her condition is known or unknown, the embryo belongs to the man who marries her and is called (the son) of a pregnant bride. [*174*] The one whom a man purchases directly from the mother and father in order to have children, whether he is like or unlike (his new father), is a son who is bought. [*175*] If a woman is deserted by her husband or becomes a widow and willingly remarries and bears a child, he is called a son born of a remarried woman. [*176*] If she still has her maidenhead intact or returns to a man she had left, she should perform the transformative ritual (of marriage) again with her husband (who thus becomes the husband) of a remarried woman. [*177*] One who has no father or mother, or who has been deserted for no good reason and gives himself to someone, is traditionally regarded as a self-given (son). [*178*] The son whom a priest begets out of lust in a servant woman is a corpse (*śava*) who saves (*pārayan*), and so he is traditionally known as a 'Saving-corpse' (*pārasava*). [*179*] A son whom a servant man begets in his slave girl, or in the slave girl of his male slave, may take a share, if he is permitted; this is the established law.

[*180*] Wise men say that these eleven sons that have been mentioned, beginning with the one born in the (husband's) field, are son-surrogates to forestall the interruption of the rituals. [*181*] The ones born of the seed of another man, who are called (sons) because of some connection, belong to the man from whose seed they are born, but not to the other man.

[*182*] If only one of several brothers born from one father has a son, Manu has said that all of them have sons because of that son. [*183*] If

only one of all the wives of one man has a son, Manu has said that all of them have sons because of that son. [*184*] In the absence of each higher son, the lower son should get the estate, but if there are many sons all alike, they share the estate. [*185*] Not brothers, not fathers – sons take the father's estate; but the father and brothers should take the estate of a man who has no son. [*186*] The libation (at the ceremony for the dead) should be made to three (ancestors), and the ball is given to three; the fourth (descendant) is the one who gives it to them, and the fifth is not involved.

[*187*] The property should belong to each successive man who is immediately next to his co-feeding relative, and after that it would belong to a member of the same family, and then to the teacher or the pupil. [*188*] But in the absence of all of these, then priests who have the triple learning and are unpolluted and self-controlled share the estate; in this way duty is not neglected. [*189*] The king should not take the material possessions of a priest; this rule always applies. But the king may take (the possessions) of the other classes in the absence of all (heirs). [*190*] (The widow) of a man who has died childless should have a son by a member of the same lineage (of the sages) and hand over to (that son) whatever property comes from his estate. [*191*] But if two sons born from two men in one woman should quarrel about the property, each of them, and not the other, should take the property of his own father.

[*192*] Now, when the mother has died, all the uterine brothers and all the 'umbilical' sisters should share equally in the mother's estate. [*193*] Something should even be given to the daughters of these daughters out of the estate of their maternal grandmother, through affection and according to their deserts. [*194*] A woman's property is traditionally regarded as of six sorts: what was given in front of the (marriage) fire, on the bridal procession, or as a token of affection, and what she got from her brother, mother, or father. [*195*] In addition, any subsequent gift and whatever her affectionate husband might give her should become the property of her children when she dies, (even) during her husband's lifetime.

[*196*] Whatever valuables (are given to a woman) in a marriage in the manner of Brahmā, the gods, the sages, the centaurs, or the Lord of Creatures belong to her husband alone if she dies childless. [*197*] But whatever property is given to her in a marriage in the manner of the demons and the others (ogres and ghouls) belongs to her mother and father if she dies childless. [*198*] And if a father should give anything valuable to a wife, the daughter of the (husband's) wife of the priestly class, or her children, may take it. [*199*] A woman should not make a great hoard of the family property that belongs to several people, nor even her own valuables, without her husband's

permission. [*200*] The heirs should not share the jewellery worn by a woman during her husband's lifetime, for if they share them they will fall.

[*201*] No share is given to a man who is impotent or fallen, or blind or deaf from birth, or a madman, an idiot, or a mute, or devoid of virile strength. [*202*] But it is proper for a wise man to give clothing and mouthfuls of food even to all of these, without limit, to the best of his ability, for if he did not give this he would fall. [*203*] But if the impotent man and the others should somehow desire wives, the children of those of them that produce offspring have a right to an inheritance.

[*204*] The younger (sons), if they have kept up their education, should have a share in whatever property the eldest (son) acquires when the father has died. [*205*] But if, not having such education, they all acquire property by a joint effort, there should be an equal division of that property, which does not come from their father; this is an established rule. [*206*] Property (gained) by education belongs to the one to whom it was given, as does property received from a friend, at marriage, or with the guest's honey-mixture.

[*207*] But if one of the brothers is able to live by his own work and does not want (any of) the property, he may give up his own share of the division when he has taken something for his livelihood. [*208*] And whatever he himself earns by his own effort and hard work without using up the wealth of his father he need not give up unless he wants to. [*209*] But if a father should take possession of wealth from his own father that he had not possessed (before), he need not share it with his sons unless he wants to, for he has earned it by himself. [*210*] If (brothers) who have divided live together again and make a new division, the division in that case should be equal; for in that case there is no primogeniture. [*211*] If the eldest or youngest of them is deprived of his share of the inheritance, or if either of them dies, his share is not lost: [*212*] his uterine brothers should come together and divide it equally, all together, with his brothers who were reunited and his uterine sisters.

[*213*] If an eldest brother should through greed act badly towards his younger brothers, he should cease to be the eldest and lose his (special) share, and kings should restrain him. [*214*] No brothers who persist in bad actions deserve the property, nor should the eldest create private property without giving anything to the youngest. [*215*] If there should be a joint undertaking by brothers who have not divided, the father should never give an unequal share to any son. [*216*] (A son)born after the division has been made should get only his father's property, or if any (sons) join with him he may share with them.

[*217*] The mother should receive the inheritance of a childless son, and if the mother is also dead the father's mother should take the property. [*218*] When everything, debts and property, has been divided in accordance with the rule, whatever may be discovered afterwards should all be distributed equally. [*219*] They say that a piece of clothing, a carriage, jewellery, cooked food, water, women, the means of security, and a pasture should not be divided.

[*220*] The division (of inheritance) and the rule for the treatment of sons, in order, beginning with the one born in the husband's field, have thus been described to you; now learn the law for gambling.

[*221*] The king should ban gambling and betting from his kingdom, for these two vices put an end to the reign of the kings who possess the land. [*222*] Since gambling and betting are open robbery, the king should make a constant effort to oppose them. [*223*] People call it gambling when it is done with objects that do not have the breath of life, but when it is done with creatures that have the breath of life it should be known as betting. [*224*] The king should physically punish anyone who gambles and bets, or gets others to do so, or servants who wear the distinctive marks of twice-born men. [*225*] He should quickly expel from the town gamblers, travelling bards, playboys, men who persist in heresy or bad actions, and bootleggers. [*226*] These concealed thieves living in the king's kingdom constantly oppress his good subjects by their bad actions. [*227*] This gambling was seen to be a great maker of enemies in a former age, and so an intelligent man should not indulge in gambling even for a joke. [*228*] If a man indulges in it openly or secretly, he should be punished in various ways according to the king's discretion.

[*229*] If someone born in a ruler, commoner, or servant womb should be unable to pay his fine, he may absolve himself of the debt by labour; a priest should pay little by little. [*230*] The king should have women, children, madmen, and the old, the poor, and the ill chastised with a whip, a bamboo cane, a rope, and so forth. [*231*] If people appointed to carry out work ruin the work of those for whom they work, being cooked by the heat of wealth, the king should have their property confiscated. [*232*] The king should physically punish men who make false proclamations, who corrupt his subjects, who kill women, children, or priests, or who serve his enemies. [*233*] Whenever something has been settled and someone punished, and he knows it has been done justly, he should not let it be taken up again or annulled. [*234*] But if his ministers or the interrogating judge should settle a case in the other way, then the king himself should settle it and he should have them fined a thousand (pennies).

[*235*] A priest-killer, a liquor-drinker, a thief, and a violator of his guru's marriage-bed – all of these, and each separately, should be

known as men who have committed major crimes. [*236*] He should inflict just punishment, both corporal and financial, on all four of these if they do not perform any restoration. [*237*] (The brand of) a vagina should be made for violating the guru's marriage-bed; the flag of a liquor-shop for drinking liquor; a dog's foot for stealing; and a headless man for priest-killing. [*238*] These miserable men – whom no one should eat with, no one should sacrifice for, no one should read to, and no one should marry – must wander the earth, excommunicated from all religion. [*239*] When they have been branded they should be abandoned by their relatives and in-laws and given no compassion or greeting: this is Manu's instruction. [*240*] However, when the prior classes have performed the restoration as it is prescribed, they should not be branded on the forehead by the king but they should have to pay the highest fine. [*241*] A priest should be fined at the middle level for these offences, or he should be exiled from the kingdom with his money and his things. [*242*] But other (classes) who have committed these evils unintentionally should have their entire property confiscated; if intentionally, they should be banished.

[*243*] A virtuous king should not take for himself the property of a man who has committed a major crime; for if he takes it out of greed he becomes smeared with that fault. [*244*] He should throw that fine into the water and offer it to Varuṇa, or give it to a virtuous priest who knows the Veda. [*245*] Varuṇa is the lord of punishment, for he holds the rod of punishment over kings; a priest who has reached the far shore of the Veda is lord of the whole universe. [*246*] Wherever the king refrains from taking the property of evil-doers, there people are born at the proper time and live long lives. [*247*] And the crops spring up separately just as the common people sowed them, and children do not die, nor is anything born deformed.

[*248*] But if a man born of a lower class intentionally bothers a priest, the king, should punish him physically with various forms of corporal and capital punishment that make men shudder. [*249*] The injustice of the king is considered just as great when he inflicts corporal or capital punishment on a man who does not deserve it as when he sets free a man who does deserve it; but it is justice when he exercises strong restraint.

[*250*] The manner of deciding suits between two people in mutual disputation, under the eighteen causes of legal action, has thus been described.

[*251*] A king who thus properly fulfils his duties to maintain justice should try to take possession of countries that he has not yet possessed and should protect those that he has. [*252*] When he has thoroughly settled the country and built forts in accordance with the teaching, he

should constantly make the utmost effort to pull out the thorns. [*253*] By protecting those who behave like Aryans and by cleaning out the thorns, kings whose highest concern is the protection of their subjects reach the triple heaven. [*254*] But if a king collects taxes without punishing thieves, his kingdom will be shaken and he will lose heaven. [*255*] If his kingdom is secure from danger by virtue of its reliance on a large army, it will constantly thrive like a well-watered tree.

[*256*] The king whose spies are his eyes should discover the two sorts of thieves, open and concealed, who steal other men's possessions. [*257*] The open deceivers are those of them who live by various sorts of shady trading, while the concealed deceivers are burglars, forest bandits, and so forth. [*258*] People who take bribes, frauds, deceivers, and gamblers; those who live by announcing good luck; smooth operators and fortune-tellers; [*259*] great ministers and doctors who behave with impropriety; those who make use of their crafts in polite society; clever whores; [*260*] these and others like them he should recognize as open thorns for the people, as well as the others who work in secret, non-Aryans who assume the distinctive marks of Aryans.

[*261*] When he has discovered them through well-skilled secret agents who engage in the activities of those people and through spies in many positions, he should incite them (to crime) and bring them under his control. [*262*] When he has had accurately proclaimed the vices in each of their activities, the king should punish them properly, according to their strength and the offence. [*263*] For only by punishment can anyone suppress the evil of evil-minded thieves who prowl silently over the earth. [*264*] Assembly halls, roadside watering places, cake-stalls, whorehouses, places where wine or food is sold, crossroads, sacred trees, crowds, public spectacles, [*265*] gardens gone to seed, wild places, the houses of artisans, empty buildings, woods, and artificial groves – [*266*] these are the sorts of places that a king should have watched by troops of soldiers, stationed and on patrol, and by spies, to foil thieves. [*267*] He should detect them and destroy them by means of clever reformed thieves who associate with them, follow them, and become familiar with their various activities. [*268*] They should round them up on the pretext of food and other enjoyments, or for audiences with priests, or on pretexts of deeds of heroism. [*269*] As for those who do not come near there and those who have discovered the plot, the king should attack them and kill them, together with their friends, maternal relatives, and paternal relatives.

[*270*] A just king should not inflict physical punishment on a thief without the stolen goods, but he may punish him without hesitation if

he has the stolen goods and the tools. [*271*] And he should also inflict physical punishment on all those who give food to thieves in villages or give them a place to stow their tools.

[*272*] If those who have been appointed to guard the districts, as well as the vassals who have been similarly ordered, remain neutral during attacks, he should swiftly punish them as if they were thieves. [*273*] And if a man who makes his living by religion should slip from the observance of his duties, the king should burn him with a fine, for he has slipped from his own duty. [*274*] When a village is being plundered, a dam broken, or a highway robbery committed while people look on, the people who do not hasten to do what they can should be banished with all their possessions.

[*275*] The king should inflict various forms of physical punishment on those who rob the treasury, persist in opposition to him, or plot with his enemies. [*276*] But if thieves break in and commit a theft at night, the king should cut off their two hands and have them impaled on a sharp stake. [*277*] On the first offence of a pickpocket, he should have two of his fingers cut off; on the second, one hand and one foot; and on the third, he should be killed. [*278*] The lord of the land should physically punish like a thief those who give (thieves) fire, food, or a place to stow their weapons, and those who are accessories to the robbery.

[*279*] If a man destroys a pond he should be physically punished by drowning or by simple killing; but even if (the criminal) repairs it, he should pay the highest level of fine. [*280*] He should without hesitation inflict physical punishment on those who break into a storehouse, an arsenal, or a temple, and those who steal elephants, horses, or chariots. [*281*] If anyone steals water from a pond that was built in former times, or cuts off the supply of water, he should be be fined at the lowest level. [*282*] If anyone excretes anything impure on the royal highway when he is not in extremity, he should pay two 'scratch-pennies' and immediately get someone to clean up the impure substance. [*283*] But a person in extremity, or an old man or a pregnant woman or a child, should be spoken to and made to clean it up; this is a fixed rule. [*284*] All doctors who commit malpractice should be fined, at the lowest level for (malpractice on) non-humans and the middle level for humans. [*285*] A person who destroys a bridge, a flag, a pole, or images and statues should repair the entire thing and pay five hundred (pennies). [*286*] For adulterating unadulterated substances, or for breaking gems or boring them incorrectly, the fine is at the lowest level. [*287*] And a man who deals crookedly with straight people or has crooked prices should pay the lowest-level fine or the middle-level.

[*288*] (The king) should have all the prisons built on the royal

highway, where the suffering and mutilated evil-doers can be seen. [*289*] He should immediately banish anyone who breaches the (city's) rampart, fills up the moat, or breaks down the gates. [*290*] A fine of two hundred (pennies) should be imposed for all magic spells, for rituals that make use of roots when they are performed by people who are not trustworthy, and for various kinds of witchcraft. [*291*] A man who sells (as seed) what is not seed, or pulls up (sown) seed, or destroys a boundary, should receive the corporal punishment of mutilation. [*292*] But a goldsmith who behaves dishonestly is the most evil of all the thorns, and the king should have him cut to pieces with razors. [*293*] For the theft of things used in ploughing, or weapons, or medicines, the king should adjust the punishment according to the time and the use.

[*294*] The king and his minister, the fort, the territory, the treasury and army, and the ally – these are its seven elements, and so the kingdom is said to have seven members. [*295*] But he should realize that of these seven elements of the kingdom, each one is more important than the one that follows it, in order, and (its loss) the greater disaster. [*296*] Yet when a seven-member kingdom stands firmly upright like three staves (tied together), no single part of it predominates, because each has qualities superior to those of the others. [*297*] For each member is specifically better qualified for certain tasks, and is said to be the best for the purpose that it can accomplish.

[*298*] By means of spying, applying energy, and engaging in actions, he should constantly ascertain his own power over his own country and others' as well as the enemy's power over his own country and others'. [*299*] And when he has thoroughly considered all the afflictions and vices (on both sides), and their importance or lack of importance, he should then resolutely undertake what is to be done. [*300*] Each time he becomes exhausted he must undertake the action again, and again; for good fortune favours the man who undertakes actions with resolution. [*301*] The king's various forms of behaviour are the Winning Age, the Age of the Trey, the Age of the Deuce, and the Losing Age; for the king is said to be the Age. [*302*] Asleep, he is the Losing Age; awake, the Age of the Deuce; when he is ready to act, the Age of the Trey; and when he is active, the Winning Age.

[*303*] The king should behave with the brilliant energy of Indra, the Sun, the Wind, Yama, Varuṇa, the Moon, Fire, and the Earth. [*304*] Just as Indra rains heavily during the four monsoon months, even so he should rain down the things that are desired in his own kingdom, behaving like Indra. [*305*] Just as the Sun takes up water with his rays for eight months, even so he should constantly take up taxes from his kingdom, for in that he behaves like the Sun. [*306*] He should pervade

(his subjects) with his spies just as the Wind moves about, pervading all creatures, for in this he behaves like the Wind. [*307*] The king should restrain his subjects just as Yama restrains both friend and foe at the proper time; for in this he behaves like Yama. [*308*] He should seize evil men just as Varuṇa is seen to bind people with his ropes; for in this he behaves like Varuṇa. [*309*] When his subjects thrill with joy in him as human beings do at the sight of the full moon, the king is behaving like the Moon. [*310*] He should constantly turn the heat of his brilliant energy and majesty against evil-doers and use it to injure corrupted vassals; this is traditionally known as behaving like Fire. [*311*] He behaves like the Earth when he supports all living beings just as the Earth bears all living beings equally.

[*312*] Using these and other means, the king should constantly and tirelessly suppress the thieves in his own kingdom and even in others' (kingdoms).

[*313*] Even during the utmost extremity, he should not make priests angry, for when angry they could instantly destroy him, with all his army and his vehicles. [*314*] Who would not be destroyed if he provoked the anger of those who made fire omnivorous, the ocean water undrinkable, and the moon to wax and wane? [*315*] Who could prosper if he harmed those who, when angered, could create other worlds and other Guardians of the World, and make the gods non-gods? [316] Who, if he wanted to live, would do violence to those upon whom the worlds and the gods depend and stand firm forever, and whose property is the Veda?

[*317*] A priest is a great deity whether or not he is learned, just as fire is a great deity whether or not it is brought to the altar. [*318*] The purifying fire with its brilliant energy is not defiled even in cremation grounds, and when oblations of butter are placed in it at sacrifices it grows even greater. [*319*] Thus priests should be revered in every way, even if they engage in all kinds of undesirable actions, for this is the supreme deity. [*320*] If the rulers become overbearing towards the priests in any way, the priests themselves should subdue them, for the rulers were born from the priests. [*321*] Fire arose from the waters, rulers from priests, and iron from stone; their all-pervading brilliant energy is quenched in their own wombs. [*322*] Rulers do not prosper without priests, and priests do not thrive without rulers; priests and rulers closely united thrive here on earth and in the world beyond.

[*323*] When a king has given the priests the wealth that comes from all fines, and has given up the kingdom to his son, he should go to his death in battle. [*324*] The king who always behaves in this way, dedicated to the duties of a king, should employ all his retainers in matters that are for the good of his people.

[*325*] The eternal rule for the innate activity of a king has thus been told in its entirety; now learn the following rule for the innate activities of a commoner and a servant, in that order.

[*326*] When a commoner has undergone the transformative rituals and has married a wife, he should constantly dedicate himself to making a living and tending livestock. [*327*] For when the Lord of Creatures emitted livestock he gave them over to the commoner, and he gave all creatures over to the priest and the king. [*328*] A commoner must never express the wish, 'I would rather not tend livestock,' nor should they ever be tended by anyone else when a commoner is willing. [*329*] He should know the high or low value of gems, pearls, coral, metals, woven cloth, perfumes, and spices. [*330*] He should know how to sow seeds, and recognize the virtues and faults of a field, and he should know how to use all sorts of weights and measures; [*331*] and the worth or worthlessness of merchandise, the good and bad qualities of countries, the profit or loss from trades, and the way to raise livestock. [*332*] And he should know the wages of hired servants, the various languages of men, the way to preserve goods, and buying and selling. [*333*] He should make the utmost effort to increase his goods by means in keeping with his duty, and take pains to give food to all creatures.

[*334*] The servant's duty and supreme good is nothing but obedience to famous priestly householders who know the Veda. [*335*] If he is unpolluted, obedient to his superiors, gentle in his speech, without a sense of 'I', and always dependent on the priests and the other (twice-born classes), he attains a superior birth (in the next life).

[*336*] The auspicious rule for the innate activities of the classes when there is no extremity has thus been described; now learn the one that they have, in order, even in extremity.

End of Chapter 9

[3] This is an idea that evidently appeals to Manu; he expresses it, in slightly different words, at 5.148 as well.

[5] 'The proper time' to have intercourse is during the fertile season.

[8] This is an old saying, that can be traced back to the Veda (*Aitareya Brāhmaṇa* 7.13.6).

[9] Some commentaries interpret the verb 'make love' (*bhaj*) as a reference to the mere physical act of sexual intercourse; some take it as an indication that the woman's heart must be given to that man at the moment of union, too, for the child to resemble him.

[13] By 'sleeping', the commentaries specify sleeping at the wrong time, too much, or in the day; one might also add, in the wrong place.

[17] Manu is, as Chapter 1 makes clear, not merely the primeval law-giver but also the son of the Lord of Creatures, and hence a creator himself. He thus 'assigns' these qualities to women in both capacities: making them originally, and recognizing them in his laws.

[20] This is a quotation from the *Śānkhāyana Gṛhya Sūtra* 3.13.5, where the verse is to be recited by an illegitimate son, and the *Āpastamba Śrauta Sūtra* 1.99, where the verse is to be recited by any sacrificer. See also *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad* 6.4.12, where there is a Vedic verse by which a man may take back the breath and sons of his 'wife's lover whom he hates'.

[21] The verse is said by the woman's son, presumably.

[23] Akṣamālā ('Wearing a Rosary'), better known as Arundhatī, married the great priestly sage Vasiṣṭha and became the paragon of wifely fidelity, though she suspected him, insulted him, abandoned him, and was cursed therefore to become a small, ugly, hardly visible star of evil omen (*Mahābhārata* 1.224.27–9). The Purāṇas and Epics without exception give her a pure priestly lineage as the daughter of Kardama, the grandson of Brahmā himself, and Devahuti, the daughter of Manu son of the Self-existent. But here Manu and the commentators (who state that she was of the lowest caste, even a 'Fierce' Untouchable [*caṇḍālī*]) say that she was low-born, in order to make the point that even a wife of a low caste (or species) may be raised up by her priestly husband. Sārangī, also called Sārngī, was a female bird (*sāranga*, or 'dappled', is the name of several species, including the *caṭaka* bird). The sage *Mandapāla*, whose ancestors were in imminent danger of destruction because he had failed to produce children, became a bird of the same species, married her, produced many children in her, and abandoned her and them (*Mahābhārata* 1.220). Thus both of these tales of upward female mobility have unhappy endings.

[24] The commentators mention Satyavatī, Gangā, and Kālī as examples of women of vile birth.

[29] This verse and the next repeat 5.164–5 in an inverted order.

[32] The sower of the seed is the biological father, who may or may not be the legal husband; the woman is the field, and the owner of the field is the legal husband. The son born in the field (the wife) by a man other than her legal husband is known as the *kṣetraja*, literally 'born in the (husband's) field', the wife's natural son. The *kṣetraja* is defined in 9.167.

[34] Sometimes the seed and sometimes the womb prevails in determining the characteristics and status of the son. Vyāsa and Ṛṣyaśṛnga, great sages whose fathers were priests and whose grandmother and mother were a female fish and a female antelope, respectively, but who were regarded as the sons of the men who begot them, are cited by the commentators as examples of the prevalence of the seed; Dhṭtarāṣṭra, whom Vyāsa begot in the 'field' of Vicitravīrya but who was regarded as Vicitravīrya's son, is given as an example of the prevalence of the womb. (*Mahābhārata* 1.57, 3.110, and 1.96–100.)

[39] Mung beans (*mudga*) are Phaseolus Mungo, pulse beans (*māṣa*) Phaseolus Raditus.

[41] The commentators gloss 'knowledge and understanding' (*jñānavijñāna*) as the Vedas and their ancillary subjects (such as grammar and logic) or canon (Veda) and tradition (*dharmaśāstra*).

[42] The commentators do not identify these songs of the wind god.

[44] Pṛthu was the first king, the husband and owner of the earth (see 7.42); kings who 'possess' the earth after him do not possess her.

[45] The commentators say that the first statement is in the *Vājasaneyī Brāhmaṇa*; see also *Āpastamba Śrauta Sūtra* 2.14.16. They do not suggest a source for the second statement.

[48] The stud (*utpādaka*, literally 'the begetter') may also be the owner of the stud.

[56] The extremity in this case would be the man's extremity, caused by his failure to produce male heirs.

[57] Here, as often, 'guru' may designate either an honoured teacher or a father. In either case, the guru's wife is the paradigmatic sexually tabu woman.

[58] The ‘appointment’ of a man to beget a child on behalf of another man, preferably his older brother, or the appointment of a woman to allow such a man to beget a child on behalf of her legal husband, is called *niyoga* in Sanskrit, and is roughly equivalent to the custom of Levirate marriage (from the Latin *leviratus*, brother-in-law). Manu is ambivalent about this procedure and therefore makes statements for and against it which seem to be contradictory but can be reconciled. On the one hand, he acknowledges its legality as an emergency measure and argues, as here, that the husband owns the children born in his ‘field’. On the other hand, he dislikes the procedure, tends to assimilate it to ‘unofficial’ adulteries (which of course he abhors), and takes every opportunity to point out that the natural father has a very serious claim to the child (in such verses as 9.181).

[59] The woman may be appointed by her husband, if he is alive and has failed to give her sons (because he is impotent [*klība*, perhaps homosexual] or sick, the commentators suggest), or by his relatives, if he has died before producing a son.

[60] The commentators do not comment on the butter. It may have a ritual role or simply serve as a lubricant for a presumably unexcited woman.

[61] Several commentaries explain this by a saying: A man who has one son has no son.

[64] This and the next three verses present a view different from that of the previous paragraph. The commentators regard this as an apparent contradiction, and take various measures to resolve it, such as distinguishing between a man other than the husband and a man other than the huband’s brother, or between a dead husband and an impotent husband, and so forth. It is more likely, however, that Manu simply included both viewpoints: for a widow to have a son by another man in an emergency is permitted by some, but not by others. Historically, it was permitted at an early period in India, and later prohibited; Manu may well represent the stage of uneasy transition.

[65] But, as one commentator points out, the practice is mentioned elsewhere in the ṛg *Veda* (10.40.2cd): ‘Who invites you as a widow takes her husband’s brother to her bed, as a young woman takes a young man to her room?’

[66] Vena was a particularly evil king, the father of the first good king, Pṛthu (see 7.41–2). When Vena was killed by priests who could no longer tolerate his irreligion, they churned his dead body to produce his son Pṛthu – a mythological parthenogenic counterpoint to the appointment of widows.

[70] The commentators suggest that the unpolluted vow consists in her devoting herself to him, and to no other man, in body, speech, and mind.

[72] ‘Corrupted’ in the sense of having her maidenhead broken or having slept with another man, the commentators suggest, and ‘concealed’ in the sense of using a garment to cover a leprous skin or a superfluous limb.

[75] The commentators suggest that in a life of restraints she should not go to other people’s houses.

[76] The commentators discuss at great length what she should do at the end of that period: go to look for him, take another husband, go on supporting herself by her approved crafts, and so forth. Several of them gloss ‘pleasure’ (*kāma*) in its more restricted sense of lust: to seek another wife that he likes better.

[77] The inheritance may consist in her own dowry or in the jewellery and so forth that he has given her. ‘Not live with her’ is interpreted variously as meaning that he should abandon her (some add that he should not, however, deprive her of a livelihood), or that he should not have sex with her (some add that he should just give her food and clothing).

[78] The commentaries suggest that her ‘transgression’ may mean that she disobeys him, but does not have sex with another man; that he may be ‘infatuated’ (*pramatta*) with gambling; and that her property may consist of kitchen utensils, servant girls, and so forth.

[79] ‘Without seed’ (*abīja*) may mean ‘impotent’ or ‘sterile’, and in the former case *klība* might mean not ‘impotent’ but ‘homosexual’.

[80] She may be superseded by another wife, even if she continues to live in the same house.

[87] An Untouchable priest is someone who, though he is actually a member of one of the four classes or even a priest, behaves like a ‘Fierce’ Untouchable (*caṇḍāla*) or becomes one through some crime.

[88] The husband should be like her in class, but in other qualities as well. The commentators dispute what ‘the right age’ is; some say eight years old, some twelve; the marriage age also differed in different families and castes. Some commentators say that a girl should not be given before she is capable of experiencing desire; some that she should be married while she still goes about naked, that is while she is still six or eight; some object to the practice of marrying off a young girl for money.

[93] By failing to see to it that she has the opportunity to bear children as soon as she begins to menstruate, the father has interfered with her child-bearing function and hence has no right to be paid for getting her a husband. Here Manu seems to advocate, or at least accept, the giving of a bride-price (*śulka*); but at 9.98–9 and 3.51–4 he argues passionately against it.

[94] In an emergency, he may marry when he is even younger than the stated ages. The ages are in any case approximate: the man should be about three times the age of the girl.

[107] There may be an implicit contrast not only between duty and desire (*dharma* and *kāma*) but between religion and pleasure (*dharma* and *kāma*) as two of the three human goals.

[110] ‘Like a relative’ (*bandhuvat*) means like a more distant relative, like an uncle.

[111] That is, if they separate, each son will perform the rituals, and so more religious merit will be generated.

[113] That is, each one would be treated like a middle son and get an equal share of what is left after the eldest and youngest have taken theirs.

[114] The commentaries say that the unspecified ten things are livestock animals.

[117] The extra portion for the eldest son gives him a total of two.

[119] Whole-hooved animals are the equines (horses, mules). If one is left over after an equal division, the animal is not to be sold to share the proceeds.

[120] The equal division would be between the son of the (presumably dead) older brother and the younger brother (the boy’s uncle) who was officially appointed to beget a child on his dead brother’s behalf. The son therefore loses the advantage that his father, the eldest brother, would have had.

[121] That is, that son should share with the younger brother. The surrogate (the son begotten by the younger brother on the eldest brother’s widow) does not have the full rights that the principal (the eldest brother) would have had, but must share with the younger brother (his legal uncle and his biological father).

[122] ‘The first wife’ is literally the eldest, but almost certainly senior not in years but in being the one first married.

[123] The first bull goes to the son superior by virtue of his own birth, and the rest to the other sons, who are inferior to him in their own births but superior to him in their mothers, and within this second group the rank is determined by the rank of the mother. This reading is further supported by the next verse. A smoother alternative interpretation, followed by Bühler, is suggested by the commentators only by forcing the meaning of ‘first-born’ to yield, in this one verse, ‘born of the first wife’, and then making the other sons ‘inferior to him on account of their mothers’.

[125] Though the commentators regard this and the following verse as contradictory to the ones immediately preceding, 9.125–6 seem merely to be adding yet another criterion to the complex mix: to the order of marriage of the mother and the order of birth of

the son is now added the possibility of different classes of mothers, and this new complexity is met with the statement that in such situations the order of the son's own birth takes precedence over both the (now irrelevant) seniority of the mother and the class of the mother.

[126] The verses of invocation to Indra are the *subrahmaṇyā* verses (*Aitareya Brāhmaṇa* 6.3). When two sons are engendered in two different women at the same time, they are regarded as twins, but the one who is born first is the eldest. On the other hand, it is said that when two twins are conceived in the same womb, the one conceived first comes out second and hence is regarded as the first-born.

[127] The daughter is appointed to bear him sons, just as a man may be appointed to beget sons in his older brother's widow.

[128] The story of Dakṣa's daughters is told (together with the story of Manu and his sons) in the *Mahābhārata* (1.70 and 12.329.57). The daughters that he gave to the moon are the constellations or lunar mansions.

[131] Separate property is particularly what is given to a woman by her father and friends at her marriage. The daughter's son throughout this paragraph is probably the son of an appointed daughter.

[134] The division would be between the man's son and the son of his appointed daughter.

[137] The chestnut horse is the sun; see 4.231.

[146] He should give the brother's property to the son that he begets in the brother's name.

[148] The sons born in one womb are either sons of the same mother or (according to the commentaries) sons of several mothers of the same class. The various wives are presumably of various classes.

[154] A 'good' son is a twice-born son.

[158] Relatives would be sons qualified to give the funeral offerings to the ancestors.

[161] The darkness is probably the darkness of hell. Bad sons are unfit sons, sons of the wrong class, the sorts of sons just enumerated, who are not fit to give the offering to the ancestors, or even to inherit; they are sons who lack virtue.

[166] 'His own field' may simply be his own wife, but probably also a wife of his own class.

[167] The marriage-bed is the equivalent of the field or the wife, as in the phrase, 'violator of the guru's marriage-bed' (*gurutalpaga*).

[168] The extremity might exist either if the adopting father has no heirs, or if the family giving the child is in need and cannot keep him. The son is probably 'like' the adopting father in class, but perhaps in other qualities.

[176] The husband with whom she undergoes this ceremony is presumably the second husband, if she is still a virgin, or the first, deserted husband, if she returns to him. The commentators suggest that she may leave him when he is a child and return to him when he reaches adolescence, or that she may leave the man to whom her father has promised her, marry another man of her choice, but then return to the man whom her father had approved of, with her maidenhead still intact.

[178] Even this son, by giving the offerings at the ceremony for the dead, saves his father from hell; see 9.138. The word *pārasava* could be given more likely etymologies, either related to the word for axe (*paraśu*), which such mixed and low castes as woodcutters might use, or as a form of the word for a man who is the offspring (*śava*) of a woman of another (*para*) class than his father or belonging to another (*para*) man.

[180] If a man does not have a natural son, all the rituals that a son must perform are jeopardized, particularly the offerings in the ceremony for the dead.

[186] The three degrees of ancestors are the father, grandfather, and great-grandfather. The fourth is the son making the offering, and the fifth the grandson.

[187] The co-feeding relative is either the *sapinda* who would normally inherit, or the dead man himself regarded as the close relative of the potential heir. The lengthy

commentaries on this particular verse are more confusing than helpful, for the general idea is clear enough: the inheritance descends in order of closeness to the dead man first within the *sapinda* line, then through the wider family, and then, if there is still no living male to take the property, to the dead man's teacher or pupil.

[196] For the various sorts of marriages, see 3.21–34.

[198] The wife must in this case be married to a man who has other wives of other classes.

[200] The phrase 'during her husband's lifetime' may refer either to the period in which the woman wore the ornaments or the period in which the heirs are not to share them.

[203] Unless *klība* is taken to mean 'homosexual', 'somehow' might indicate appointing another man to produce a child in the husband's field.

[208] 'Give up' means share it with his brothers.

[210] The brothers here are divided both in the sense of having separated from one another and in the sense of having divided up the paternal property, after the father has died (as seems to be assumed in this verse) or even while he is alive.

[216] He may share his own paternal inheritance with them; or, when the father dies, the brothers may redistribute their former inheritance plus the posthumous son's inheritance and give him a share in that.

[217] The commentaries have laboured in vain to reconcile this verse with 9.185, which seems to have other circumstances in mind.

[223] Betting on living animals includes cock-fights and ram-fights, and perhaps horse-races as well.

[224] The usual punishment was the mutilation of a limb.

[231] 'Cooked by the heat of wealth' is a metaphor for the change that takes place when people handle money, just like the transformation of clay when heat is applied to it in an oven. A more technical interpretation of the verse would be, 'If people appointed to carry out *public* work ruin the business of clients …'

[232] Here, as so often, the verb (*hanyāt*, 'he should physically punish') may indicate either corporal or capital punishment. The commentators suggest that the subjects who are corrupted include, particularly, the king's ministers.

[235] The guru's wife may simply be the wife of one's revered teacher, but may also denote the wife of any closely related and respected male, particularly one's father. The crime is therefore tantamount to incest. See 11.103.

[240] The 'prior' classes are the first three classes (the twice-born), as well as those 'priorly' mentioned in this text. For the levels of fines, see 8.138.

[245] This verse depends on a triple pun on *daṇḍa*, which means a rod or staff, a punishment, and a fine.

[249] He should exercise restraint either by restraining criminals justly or by restraining himself (from unjust corporal or capital punishment, perhaps).

[250] The eighteen causes of legal action are listed in 8.4–7 and the discussion of them is actually completed by the end of the section on gambling, 9.228.

[252] As in 1.115, the thorns are dissidents and other criminal types.

[273] The commentaries suggest that a man, such as a priest, who lives on other people's religion by performing sacrifices on their behalf, and so forth, might neglect his own personal religious duties and be culpable in this.

[282] The commentators suggest that the impurity might be urine or excrement; that the emergency might be caused by fear of something such as a tiger or by illness; and that the man would get a 'Fierce' Untouchable to clean it up.

[283] One commentator suggests that someone should say to such a person, 'Don't do it again.'

[290] The commentaries say that the spells are intended to kill, and that if they are successful they should incur the punishment for murder; that the rituals with roots, intended to

bring people into one's power, are permitted if practised against one's husband or relatives, but not against strangers; and that the witchcraft is to bring disease or failure upon an enemy.

[293] Such thefts would be more severely penalized at times of ploughing, war, or illness, when the things are especially needed.

[294] At 7.156–7 the ally is omitted, and the state is said to have only six members; moreover, the elements (*prakṛtis*) in that passage are not elements of the state but elements of the circle of various kings in different combinations of alliance and hostility.

[306] The Wind is said to appear as the vital breath inside all living creatures.

[307] Yama, whose name is sometimes connected with the verb 'to restrain' (*ni-yam*), making him 'The Restrainer', restrains everyone, though particularly evil-doers, at the moment of death.

[308] Varuṇa's 'ropes' consist of diseases, particularly dropsy (Varuṇa is also god of the waters), with which he binds sinners.

[314] The verse alludes to myths about three great priests: When the god of fire told an ogre that he had a right to take away the wife of the great sage Bhṛgu, Bhṛgu cursed Fire to be omnivorous (*Mahābhārata* 1.6; 12.329.43); the sage named Mare's Mouth (Vadavāmukha, here regarded as an incarnation of Visnu) cursed the Ocean to be salty, and made him salty with the sage's sweat, in punishment for his refusal to come when the sage called him (*Mahābhārata* 12.329.48); the sage Daksa cursed the Moon to wane and wax because the Moon, to whom Daksa had given his twenty-seven daughters in marriage, favoured one and neglected the others (*Mahābhārata* 9.34.40–67; 12.329.45–6). See Manu 9.129.

[315] The great sage Viśvāmitra created another universe (*Rāmāyana* 1.56–9); the tiny Vālakhilya sages, insulted by Indra (one of the four Guardians of the World), created another Indra to replace him (*Mahābhārata* 1.27); and the sage Māṇḍavya cursed the god Dharma/Yama to become incarnate as a servant (*Mahābhārata* 1.101).

[321] Fire is born from water in many ways in Indian mythology: the sun from the cosmic waters, lightning from clouds, and the submarine Mare's Mouth fire from the ocean. According to many Vedic texts (*Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* 12.7.3.12; *Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa* 2.8.8.9; *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad* 1.4.11–13), rulers were born from priests at the original creation and, once more, when it was necessary for the priests to create a new race of rulers after Paraśurāma had exterminated them (*Mahābhārata* 1.98).

CHAPTER 10

[*1*] The three twice-born classes, remaining within their own respective innate activities, should study (the Veda), but among them the priest, and not the other two, should proclaim it; this is an unvarying rule. [*2*] The priest should know the means of livelihood of all of them in accordance with the rules; he should proclaim this to the others and he himself should live by it. [*3*] The priest is the lord of the (other) classes because he is pre-eminent, because he is the best by nature, because he maintains the restraints, and because of the pre-eminence of his transformative rituals. [*4*] The priest, the ruler, and the commoner are the three twice-born classes, but the fourth, the servant, has only one birth, and there is no fifth.

[*5*] Among all the classes, only (children) who are born 'with the grain', (or) in wives who are equal (in class) and have their maidenheads intact (at marriage), should be considered members of the caste. [*6*] They say that sons begotten by twice-born men on wives of the very next (lower) class are similar (to their fathers) but despised for the flaw in their mothers.

[*7*] That is the eternal rule for (sons) born in women of the very next (lower) class; now learn the following rule of law for those who are born in women two or three classes lower.

[*8*] From a priest in the daughter of a commoner a son (of the caste) called 'Remaining-with-the-Mother' is born, and in the daughter of a servant a son (of the) 'Hunter' (caste), also called a 'Saving-corpse'. [*9*] From a ruler in the daughter of a servant is born a creature with the form of both a ruler and a servant, cruel in his conduct and his amusements, and called 'Dreaded'. [*10*] (Children) begotten by a priest (in women) in the three (lower) classes, or by a king (in women) in the two (lower) classes, or by a commoner (in women) in the one (lower) class – all six are traditionally regarded as outcasts.

[*11*] From a ruler in the daughter of a priest is born a (son) of the 'Charioteer' (caste), and the sons born from a commoner in women of the royal and priestly classes belong to the 'Magadhan' and 'Videhan' castes, respectively. [*12*] (Sons) of confused classes are born from a servant in women of the commoner, royal, and priestly classes: the 'Unfit', the 'Carver', and the 'Fierce' Untouchable, the worst of men. [*13*] And just as the 'Remaining-with-the-Mother' and the 'Dreaded' are traditionally said to be born 'with the grain' in (a woman) two classes (lower), the 'Carver' and the 'Videhan' are born 'against the grain' in the same way (in women two classes higher).

[*14*] The sons born of twice-born men in women of the very next

(lower) class, that have been enumerated in order, are called 'Of the Next (Lower Class)', because of the flaw in their mothers.

[*15*] A (son) born from a priest in the daughter of a man of the 'Dreaded' (caste) is (of the caste) called 'Concealed'; (the son of a priest born) in the daughter of a man of the 'Remaining-with-the-Mother' caste is of the 'Cowherd' caste; in the daughter of a man of the 'Unfit' caste, (he is of the) 'Shame on you!' (caste).

[*16*] Three outcasts – an 'Unfit', a 'Carver', and a 'Fierce' Untouchable, the lowest of men – are born from a servant 'against the grain'. [*17*] Three other outcasts are born 'against the grain': from the commoner, the 'Magadhan' and 'Videhan' castes, and from the ruler, the 'Charioteer'. [*18*] The son born of a 'Hunter' in a servant woman is a member of the 'Tribal' caste, and the one born of a servant in a 'Hunter' woman is traditionally said to be a 'Wild Rooster'. [*19*] (The son) begotten in a 'Dreaded' woman by a 'Carver' man is known as a 'Dog-cooker'; the one born in a 'Remaining-with-the-Mother' woman by a 'Videhan' man is called a 'Reed-worker'.

[*20*] But the designation of outlaw should be given to those whom twice-born men beget upon women of the same class but who do not fulfil their vows and stop reciting the verse to the sun-god. [*21*] From an outlaw who is a priest the evil-hearted 'Birch-thorn' is born, as well as the 'Avantian', 'Banyans and Grain', 'Flower-bearing' and 'Having a Crest of Hair'. [*22*] From an outlaw who is a ruler are born the (castes) 'Pugilist', 'Wrestler', and 'Licchavian', 'Dancer', 'Scribe', 'Scab', and 'Southerner'. [*23*] From an outlaw who is a commoner are born the 'Having an Excellent Bow' and 'Teacher', 'Kārusan', 'Bastard', 'Friendly', and 'Sātvat'.

[*24*] Through sexual misconduct between classes, through (carnal) knowledge of women who should not be known, and through rejection of one's own innate activity, (sons) of confused class are born. [*25*] I will now explain, leaving nothing out, those who come from wombs of confused class, both 'with the grain' and 'against the grain', and (whose parents were) illicitly addicted to one another.

[*26*] The 'Charioteer', the 'Videhan', and the 'Fierce' Untouchable, the lowest of men, as well as the 'Magadhan', the man of the 'Carver' caste, and the 'Unfit', [*27*] these six beget (children of) similar classes in wombs of their own (caste), and they also produce (similar) children in a woman of their mother's caste or in higher wombs. [*28*] Just as a (second) self is born of a man in (women of) two of the three classes, (a woman) from the very next (lower) class or of a birth like his own, so it goes in the same order among the excluded classes. [*29*] But they also beget a great many excluded and despised children, even more defiled than they are themselves, in one another's wives. [*30*]

And just as a servant produces an excluded creature in a woman of the priestly class, so an excluded man produces an even more excluded (child in a woman) of the four classes. [31] Excluded, defective men, going 'against the grain', produce still more excluded, defective classes, fifteen of them.

[32] An alien begets on an 'Unfit' (woman) a 'Plough-holder', who knows how to adorn and to give personal service, makes a living by snaring animals, and lives like a slave, though he is not a slave. [33] A 'Videhan' produces a 'Quite Friendly', who has a sweet voice, praises men all the time, and rings a bell at sunrise. [34] A 'Hunter' produces a 'Seeker', a slave who lives by working as a boatman and whom the inhabitants of the Land of the Aryans call a 'Fisherman'. [35] These three are of inferior birth, each begotten upon 'Unfit' women who are not Aryan, who wear the clothing of the dead, and who eat disgusting food.

[36] From a 'Hunter' is born an 'Inferior Worker', who works with leather, and from a 'Videhan' come an 'Andhran' and a 'Fatty', who live outside the village. [37] From a 'Fierce' Untouchable man and a 'Videhan' woman comes a 'Pale Puppy-cooker', whose business is bamboo; and from a 'Hunter' (with her) a 'Wanderer' is born. [38] From a 'Fierce' Untouchable man in a 'Tribal' woman the evil 'Puppy-cooker' is born, who makes his livelihood from the vice of roots and is always despised by good people. [39] A 'Hunter' woman bears to a 'Fierce' Untouchable man a son 'Who Ends Up at the Bottom', who haunts the cremation-grounds and is despised even by the excluded castes. [40] These (castes), born of the confusion of classes and defined by their father and mother, may be recognized by their own innate activities, whether they conceal or reveal themselves.

[41] The six sons born in women of the same caste or the very next lower caste have the duties of the twice-born; but all those who are born from a degradation are traditionally regarding as having the same duties as servants. [42] Yet by the powers of their seed and their inner heat, in age after age these (castes) are pulled up or pulled down in birth among men here on earth. [43] But by failing to perform the rituals or to seek audiences with priests, the following castes of the ruling class have gradually sunk in the world to the rank of servants: [44] the 'Sugarcane-boilers', 'Colas', and 'Southerners', 'Kambojas', 'Greeks', 'Scythians', 'Quicksilvers', 'Persians', and 'Chinese', 'Mountaineers', 'Precipice-dwellers', and 'Scabs'.

[45] All of those castes who are excluded from the world of those who were born from the mouth, arms, thighs, and feet (of the primordial Man) are traditionally regarded as aliens, whether they speak barbarian languages or Aryan languages. [46] Those who are traditionally regarded as outcasts (born) of the twice-born and as born

of degradation should make their living by their innate activities, which are reviled by the twice-born: [*47*] for 'Charioteers', the management of horses and chariots; for the caste of 'Remaining-with-the-Mother', medical healing; for the 'Videhan' caste, doing things for women; and for the 'Magadhan' caste, trade; [*48*] for the 'Hunters', killing fish; for the 'Unfit', carpentry; for the 'Fatty', 'Andhran', 'Notorious', and 'Diver-bird', the slaughter of animals that live in the wilderness; [*49*] for those of the 'Carver', 'Dreaded', and 'Tribal' castes, catching and killing animals that live in holes; for those of the 'Shame on you!' caste, leather-working; for those of the 'Reed-worker' caste, playing the drum.

[*50*] These (castes) should live near mounds, trees, and cremation-grounds, in mountains and in groves, recognizable and making a living by their own innate activities. [*51*] But the dwellings of 'Fierce' Untouchables and 'Dog-cookers' should be outside the village; they must use discarded bowls, and dogs and donkeys should be their wealth. [*52*] Their clothing should be the clothes of the dead, and their food should be in broken dishes; their ornaments should be made of black iron, and they should wander constantly. [*53*] A man who carries out his duties should not seek contact with them; they should do business with one another and marry with those who are like them. [*54*] Their food, dependent upon others, should be given to them in a broken dish, and they should not walk about in villages and cities at night. [*55*] They may move about by day to do their work, recognizable by distinctive marks in accordance with the king's decrees; and they should carry out the corpses of people who have no relatives; this is a fixed rule. [*56*] By the king's command, they should execute those condemned to death, always in accordance with the teachings, and they should take for themselves the clothing, beds, and ornaments of those condemned to death.

[*57*] An unknown man, of no (visible) class but born of a defiled womb and no Aryan, may seem to have the form of an Aryan, but he can be discovered by his own innate activities. [*58*] Un-Aryan behaviour, harshness, cruelty, and habitual failure to perform the rituals are the manifestations in this world indicating that a man is born of a defiled womb. [*59*] A man born of a bad womb shares his father's character, or his mother's, or both; but he can never suppress his own nature. [*60*] A man born of the confusion of wombs, even if he comes from a leading family, will inherit that very character, to a greater or lesser degree. [*61*] But the kingdom in which these degraded bastards are born, defiling the classes, quickly perishes, together with the people who live there.

[*62*] Giving up the body instinctively for the sake of a priest or cow or in the defence of women and children is the way for even the

excluded (castes) to achieve success. [*63*] Manu has said that non-violence, truth, not stealing, purification, and the suppression of the sensory powers is the duty of the four classes, in a nutshell. [*64*] If someone born from a priest in a servant woman produces a child with someone of the higher (caste), the lower (caste) reaches the status of birth of the higher caste after the seventh generation. [*65*] (Thus) a servant attains the rank of priest, and a priest sinks to the rank of servant; and you should know that this can happen to someone born of a ruler, too, or of a commoner. [*66*] But if this (question) should arise: ‘Which is higher, someone born by chance from a priest father in a non-Aryan mother, or from a non-Aryan father in a mother of the priestly class?’, [*67*] this is the decision: ‘Someone born from an Aryan father in a non-Aryan woman may become an Aryan in his qualities; but someone born from a non-Aryan father in an Aryan mother is a non-Aryan.’ [*68*] The law has been established: neither of these may undergo the transformative rituals, because the birth of the former is deficient in (Aryan) characteristics, and the latter is born ‘against the grain’.

[*69*] Just as good seed, sown in a good field, culminates in a birth, so the son born from an Aryan father in an Aryan mother deserves every transformative ritual. [*70*] Some wise men value the seed, others the field, and still others both the seed and the field; but this is the final decision on this subject: [*71*] seed sown in the wrong field perishes right inside it; and a field by itself with no seed also remains barren. [*72*] And since sages have been born in (female) animals by the power of the seed, and were honoured and valued, therefore the seed is valued. [*73*] Comparing a non-Aryan who carries out the innate activities of an Aryan and an Aryan who carries out the innate activities of a non-Aryan, the Creator said, ‘The two are neither equal nor non-equal.’

[*74*] Priests who remain within the womb of the Veda and are steadfast in carrying out their own innate activities should make a living properly by six innate activities, in order, [*75*] the six innate activities of a high-born priest: teaching (the Veda), reciting (the Veda), sacrificing for themselves, sacrificing for others, giving, and receiving. [*76*] But of the six innate activities, three innate activities are his means of livelihood: sacrificing for others, teaching, and receiving gifts from a pure man. [*77*] Three duties of a priest are denied to a ruler: teaching, sacrificing for others, and, third, receiving gifts. [*78*] And these are also denied to a commoner; this is a fixed rule. For Manu the Lord of Creatures has said that these duties are not for those two (classes). [*79*] As a means of livelihood, bearing weapons and missiles is for a ruler, while trade, (tending) livestock, and farming are for a commoner. But their duty is giving, reciting (the

Veda), and sacrificing. [*80*] Teaching the Veda, for a priest, protecting, for a ruler, and trading, for a commoner, are pre-eminent among their own innate activities.

[*81*] But a priest who cannot make a living by his own innate activity just described may make his living by fulfilling the duty of a ruler, for he is the very next lower class. [*82*] And if (this question) should arise: 'What if he cannot make a living by either of these two (livelihoods)?', he may make his living by farming and tending livestock, the livelihood of the commoner. [*83*] But a priest or ruler who makes a living by the livelihood of a commoner should try hard to avoid farming, which generally causes violence and is dependent on others. [*84*] Some people think, 'Farming is a virtuous trade,' but as a livelihood it is despised by good people, for the wooden (plough) with the iron mouth injures the earth and the creatures that live in the earth.

[*85*] But if, for insufficient means of livelihood, a man gives up the duty in which he is skilled, to increase his wealth he may sell the merchandise that commoners sell, with the following exceptions: [*86*] he should avoid (selling) all spices, cooked food with sesame oil, stones, salt, livestock, and human beings; [*87*] all dyed cloth, as well as cloth made of hemp, linen, or wool, even if they are not dyed; fruit, roots, and medicinal herbs; [*88*] water, weapons, poison, meat, Soma, all sorts of perfumes, milk, ordinary and special honey, yogurt, clarified butter, oil, sugar, and sacrificial grass; [*89*] all of the animals that live in the wilderness, animals with fangs, and birds; wine, indigo, lac, and all animals that have a whole hoof. [*90*] But a farmer may sell pure sesame seeds for religious purposes as much as he likes, if he grows them himself and has not kept them for long. [*91*] If he uses the sesame seeds for anything other than food, unguents, or gifts, he will become a worm (in his next life) and be submerged in the excrement of dogs, together with his ancestors.

[*92*] By (selling) meat, lac, or salt, a priest immediately falls; by selling milk, he becomes a servant in three days. [*93*] But by willingly selling other (forbidden) merchandise, a priest assumes the nature of a commoner here on earth in seven nights. [*94*] Spices may be weighed in exchange for spices in equal quantities, but not salt for spices; cooked food (may be weighed in exchange) for uncooked food, and sesame seeds for equal (quantities of) grain.

[*95*] A ruler in adversity may also make a living by all of these (means); but he should never be so proud as to assume the livelihood of his betters. [*96*] If a man of the lowest caste should, through greed, make his living by the innate activities of his superiors, the king should confiscate his wealth and banish him immediately. [*97*] One's own duty, (even) without any good qualities, is better than someone

else's duty well done; for a man who makes his living by someone else's duty immediately falls from (his own) caste. [*98*] A commoner who cannot make a living by his own duty may also subsist by the livelihood of a servant; but he must not commit actions that (he) should not do, and he should stop when he can. [*99*] If a servant is unable to engage in the service of the twice-born and is on the brink of losing his sons and wife, he may make a living by the innate activities of a manual labourer, [*100*] practising those activities of a manual labourer and those various handicrafts by which the twice-born are served.

[*101*] A priest who remains on his own path and does not engage in the commoner's livelihood, even when he is fainting and starving for lack of a livelihood, should act in keeping with the following law: [*102*] a priest in adversity may accept gifts from anyone, for the assertion that 'What is purifying can be defiled' is not established by law. [*103*] Accepting gifts from despicable people or teaching them or sacrificing for them is not a fault in priests, for they are the equals of fire or water. [*104*] A man who eats the food of anyone, no matter who, when he is on the brink of losing his life is not smeared with evil, just as the sky is not smeared with mud.

[*105*] Ajīgarta, famished, stepped forward to kill his own son but was not smeared with evil, for he was acting to remedy his hunger. [*106*] When Vāmadeva, who knew the difference between right and wrong, was in distress and wanted to eat the flesh of a dog in order to save his life's breath, he was not smeared (with evil). [*107*] When Bharadvāja, who had amassed great inner heat, was distressed by hunger with his sons in a deserted forest, he accepted many cows from the carpenter Vṛdhu. [*108*] When Visvāmitra, who knew the difference between right and wrong, was distressed by hunger, he set out to eat the hindquarters of a dog, which he received from the hands of a 'Fierce' Untouchable.

[*109*] Among accepting gifts (from despicable men), sacrificing for them, or teaching them, accepting gifts is the worst and most despised for a priest (even) after his death. [*110*] Sacrificing and teaching are always done for men who have undergone the transformative rituals, but gifts are accepted even from a servant of the lowest birth. [*111*] The error of sacrificing or teaching (despicable men) is dispelled by chanting (the Veda) and making offerings into the fire, but the one that arises from accepting gifts (from them is dispelled) by discarding (the gift) and by inner heat.

[*112*] A priest who cannot make a living should even glean (ears of corn) and gather (single grains) from any (field) whatsoever; gleaning is better than accepting gifts, and gathering is preferable even to that. [*113*] If priests who are Vedic graduates are fainting (with hunger) for

want of base metals or money, they should ask the king, and if he does not wish to give anything he should be rejected. [*114*] (Accepting) an untilled field is not as much of a fault as (accepting) a tilled one; a cow, a goat, a sheep, gold, grain, and cooked food – each (is less of a fault to accept) than the one that follows it.

[*115*] There are seven ways of getting property in accordance with the law: inheriting, finding, buying, conquering, investing, working, and accepting from good people. [*116*] (Imparting) knowledge, handicrafts, working for wages, service, tending livestock, marketing, farming, being supported, begging for alms, and lending money are ten ways of making a living. [*117*] Neither a priest nor a ruler should lend money at interest, but (either) may, if he really wishes, and for religious purposes, lend at very low interest to a very evil man.

[*118*] A ruler in extremity who takes even a quarter (of the crop) is free from offence if he protects his subjects to his utmost ability. [*119*] His own duty is conquest, and he must not turn his back on a challenge; when he has protected the commoner with his sword, he may collect the just tax from him: [*120*] the tax on grain from the commoners is one eighth, (or) one twentieth, (or) at least one 'scratch-penny'. Servants, artisans, and craftsmen should give him the service of their innate activities.

[*121*] But if a servant is searching for a means of livelihood he may make himself useful to a ruler, it is said; or a servant may try to make a living by making himself useful to a wealthy commoner. [*122*] But he should make himself useful to priests, either for the sake of heaven or for the sake of both (worlds), for by the mere word 'priest' he achieves what is to be done. [*123*] Serving priests alone is recommended as the best innate activity of a servant; for whatever he does other than this bears no fruit for him. [*124*] They should assign him a livelihood out of their own family property according to his deserts, taking into account his ability, his skill, and the number of his dependants. [*125*] They should give him the leftovers of their food, their old clothes, the spoiled parts of their grain, and their worn-out household utensils.

[*126*] A servant cannot commit any crime that causes him to fall, nor does he deserve any transformative ritual; he has no authority to carry out duties, nor is he forbidden to carry out duties. [*127*] But servants who want to carry out duties, who know duty, and who emulate the duties of good men, without reciting Vedic verses, are not defiled but praised. [*128*] For the more a servant undertakes the behaviour of good men, without resentment, the more he gains this world and the next, blameless. [*129*] A servant should not amass wealth, even if he has the ability, for a servant who has amassed wealth annoys priests.

[*130*] The duties for the four classes in extremity, through which, properly pursued, they attain the ultimate level of existence, have thus been proclaimed.

[*131*] The rule for the four classes has thus been proclaimed in its entirety. After that I will explain the auspicious rule for restorations.

End of Chapter 10

[2] Since 'others' here is plural rather than dual, it would seem to include the servant class.

[3] See 1.93, where similar reasons for the priest's superiority are given. The commentators suggest that his transformative rituals are pre-eminent because he is initiated earlier than the others.

[5] 'With the grain' (*ānulomyena*), literally 'with the hair', i.e. the natural direction of marriage, designates a hypergamous union, where the husband is of a class higher than that of the wife, in contrast with hypogamous marriages that are 'against the grain' (*pratiloman*). Since the wives here are said to be equal to their husbands, it may be that they are equal in ways other than class, as is suggested by the next two verses. This, however, goes 'against the grain' of all the commentators, one of whom attempts to solve the dilemma by suggesting that 'with the grain' here means that the husband is older (as Manu advises that he should be, in 9.94). 10.41 (which refers to children born of both kinds of wives) suggests another solution, which has been adopted here by inserting an 'or'. In any case, the child of the union is to have the caste of his father.

[8] The names of the castes are difficult to translate, and it is unlikely that people using those names thought about what they meant, any more than we think of the meaning of 'Brown' or 'Smith' when we use such names. Nevertheless, the caste names do have suggestive lexical elements and I thought it worthwhile to try to indicate, quite tentatively, what some of these might be. The *ambaṣṭha* is born of the commoner wife, and the *niṣāda* ('Hunter') or *pāraśava* ('Saving-corpse', whose name is explained at 9.178) of the servant wife.

[9] This is the *ugra*, mentioned at 4.212.

[10] These outcasts are the *apasadas*.

[11] The 'Charioteer' (*sūta*) is also an oral poet, the traditional narrator of the Epics and Purāṇas. The *māgadha* is, like the 'Charioteer', a court poet, a professional panegyrist. Magadha and Videha are ancient kingdoms on the Ganges.

[12] The *āyogava* ('Unfit', a caste of carpenters) is born from the wife of the commoner class; the *ksattṛ* ('Carver', oddly enough also the name of the priest who carves up the victim in a Vedic sacrifice) from the wife of the royal class; and the *caṇḍāla* (the 'Fierce', and paradigmatic, Untouchable) from the wife of the priestly class. The higher the wife, the lower the mixed offspring.

[14] 'Of the Next (Lower Class)' is *anantara*.

[15] These are the *āvṛtas, ābhīras*, and *dhigvaṇas*.

[16] This and the next verse are paraphrases of 10.12 and 1o.11, adding the essential term 'against the grain' to designate union with a woman of a higher class than that of the man.

[18] The 'Tribal' is a *pulkasa* (or *pukkasa*) and the 'Wild Rooster' is a *kukkuṭaka*.

[19] The 'Dog-cooker' is the *śvapāka* (a term of opprobrium often more loosely applied to any Untouchable) and the 'Reed-worker' is the *veṇa* (a man who uses reeds, either as a musician or as a basket-maker).

[20] Outlaws (literally, 'Men of [Unorthodox] Vow', *vrātyas*), are sometimes said to be members of a non-Aryan religious sect rather than the fallen Aryans that Manu

defines. See 2.39.

[21] 'Birch-thorn' is *bhūrjakaṇṭaka* (who is sometimes said to be a sorcerer), 'Avantian' is *āvantya*, 'Banyans and Grain' is *vāṭadhāna*, 'Flower-bearing' is *puṣpadha*, and 'Having a Crest of Hair' is *śaikha*. The commentators say that the mothers of these castes should be of the priestly class like their *vrātya* father. Avanti is in Western Malva, and the *vāṭadhānas* are said to be northern tribes.

[22] 'Pugilist' is *jhalla*, 'Wrestler' is *malla*, 'Licchavian' is a man from Licchavi (in Tirhut, northern India), 'Dancer' is *naṭa*, 'Scribe' is *karaṇa* (literally 'Doer', a caste of scribes and accountants), 'Scab' is *khasa*, and 'Southerner' is *draviḍa* (a man from the Deccan and the lands south of the Deccan, the parts of India where they speak Dravidian languages – Tamil, Telugu, Kannada, Malayalam, and Tulu).

[23] 'Having an Excellent Bow' is *sudhanva*, 'Teacher' is *ācārya*, 'Bastard' is *vijanman*, 'Friendly' is *maitra*, and 'Kāruṣan' and 'Sātvat' are people from the parts of India called the Kāruṣas and the Sātvats.

[27] These six men, themselves born 'against the grain', compound the felony and perpetuate it by producing children 'against the grain' when they beget them in women of the caste of their mother (who is of higher birth than their father).

[28] The second self, a son legitimately similar to his father, may be born in a woman of equal or immediately lower class. But even among the excluded classes (those described in 10.8–27, even below the servants, i.e. Untouchables), themselves born of women farther removed from their husbands' classes or of higher classes, the legitimate son is defined, as he is for the accepted classes, as born 'with the grain' – of a mother equal to or immediately lower than his father.

[29] That is, the men of one excluded caste beget even worse children with the women of another excluded caste.

[31] 'Against the current' (*pratikūlam*, a synonym for 'against the grain', another term for sexual union with higher-class women) is parsed by the commentators in various ways to come up with a total of fifteen classes, not, strictly speaking, social classes or *varṇas*, of which there are only four, but classes in the broader sense, here classes of Untouchables. Starting with the six outcasts born 'against the grain', it is argued that the lowest (the 'Fierce' Untouchable) produces new castes with women of the five (Untouchable) classes above him; and so on until the 'Magadhan', the highest, produces degraded races with only one, in his own caste: $5+4+3+2+1=15$.

[32] The term 'alien' (*dasyu*, defined at 10.45) here seems to refer to the fifteen outcast tribes just mentioned. A 'Plough-holder' (*sairindhra*) is usually a personal valet (the women are maids: Draupadī in the *Mahābhārata* becomes a *sairindhrī* and serves a queen), who dresses hair and attends at the bath, or a gamekeeper.

[33] The commentators assume, and verse 10.35 states, that the mother in this verse and the next is an 'Unfit' woman, as in the previous verse; the offspring, 'Quite Friendly', is the *maitreyaka*.

[34] The 'Seeker' (*mārgava*) is also called a *kaivarta*, who seems (from 8.260, for instance) to be some sort of fisherman.

[36] The mother in this verse may be an 'Unfit' woman, as in the previous three verses, or a 'Videhan' woman, as in the next verse. Both are problematic, since the 'Hunter' is said to produce other castes from these very women in verses 10.34 and 10.37. In any case, the three castes produced here are the *kārāvara*, *āndhra*, and *meda*. Andhra is a province of South India.

[37] As *sopāka* seems to be a corruption of *śvapāka*, *pāṇḍusopāka* may be rendered as 'Pale Puppy-cooker', and as *āhiṇḍika* may be connected with the verb *hiṇḍ*, to wander, he might be called a 'Wanderer'; but both of these etymologies are even more speculative than the others constructed for caste names in this translation.

[38] The 'Puppy-cooker''s profession is much debated by lexicographers. It seems to imply that he digs up and sells roots that are fatal poisons, addictive drugs, or used in

malevolent magic rituals; see 11.64.

[39] The one 'Who Ends Up at the Bottom' is the *antyāvasāyin*.

[41] The six acceptable sons 'with the grain' (a priest with a woman of the class of priest or ruler, a ruler with a woman of the class of ruler or commoner, and a commoner with a woman of the class of commoner or servant) are described in 10.5–7. Those born of 'degradation' are the sons born 'with the grain' but in women more than one class below the father.

[42] These castes are probably those mentioned in the second half of the preceding verse, who rise in age after age (either in their own successive rebirths or in successive Ages, or *yugas*, of the world) by their own acts that generate inner heat and by the prevalence of their 'seed', that is, the higher class of their father (since they are born 'with the grain').

[44] This list is a strange mixture of the names of geographical and political groups outside the borders of the Land of the Aryans, which have been left untranslated (except for 'Southerners', for *dravidas*, and 'Greeks', for *yavanas* ['Ionians']) and names of castes and tribes in Northern India: the 'Sugarcane-boilers' (*paundrakas*, who live in South Bihar and Bengal), the 'Quicksilvers' (*pāradas*, whose name may also be related to adultery, *paradārya*), the 'Mountaineers' (*kirātas*), 'Precipice-dwellers' (*daradas*, who live near Peshawar), and 'Scabs' (*khasas*, a variant of *khasas*, already defined in 10.22).

[45] The servants are born from the feet of the primordial man (1.87), and so these alien (*dasyu*) tribes, being non-Aryan, are even lower than the tribes who are equated with servants in 10.41–4.

[46] The outcasts are defined at 10.16–17, the degraded castes at 10.41.

[48] 'Notorious' (*cuñcu*) and 'Diver-bird' (*madgu*) have not been mentioned yet, though some commentators identify the *cucuka* (*sic*, 'Stammerer') as the offspring of a commoner and a woman of the ruler class, and the 'Diver-bird' as the son of a servant and a woman of the ruling class.

[51] 'They must use discarded bowls' (*apapātra*) is sometimes said to mean that the bowls that they touch must be discarded, or that they must not use any bowls at all, but the present translation seems better supported by 10.52 and 10.54.

[55] The distinctive mark by which they are recognized (*cihnita*) might be a brand made (by the king) on the forehead or elsewhere on the body, or simply something worn or carried, as in 10.52.

[56] Here, for once, *han* and *vadh* seem unequivocally to indicate capital rather than corporal punishment.

[60] 'That' character may be the character of both parents, of his father, or the bad character of the confusion of classes.

[63] Similar virtues are extolled at 4.246 and 5.107, and a more extensive concise version of the eternal duty, entailing ten points, is given at 6.91–4.

[64] The genders of the parents of this transitional child have purposely been left ambiguous here, for the Sanskrit (in which both of them are male, the unmarked gender) is interpreted by some commentators to indicate that a man born of a priest father and servant mother has a child with a woman of the priestly class, others that a woman born of a priest father and servant mother has a child with a priest. It is possible that Manu meant to allow for both possibilities.

[69] This and the following verses recapitulate much of 9.33–41.

[72] Here the commentators refer to the story of ṛṣyaśṛnga, 'the sage with an antelope horn', a great sage whose mother was a gazelle (*Mahābhārat*a 3.110–13); see also 9.34n and 10.42n. But compare the prohibition against sex with a female animal in 11.174.

[73] That is, they are not equal because they are of different classes, but they are not

unequal (that is, they are equal) in carrying out actions that are inappropriate to them and that they should therefore not do.

[83] The Vedic graduate should avoid dependence on others (see 4.159–60), and the farmer is dependent on his beasts of burden, bullocks and so forth.

[88] *Kṣaudra* and *madhu* seem to be two different kinds of honey.

[90] The commentaries suggest that the 'religious purposes' (*dharmārtham*) might be that he will give (to priests) the money that he gets for the seeds, or that they are to be used in a sacrifice or in connection with an obligatory ritual.

[91] The commentators suggest that the forbidden uses of sesame seeds might include selling them for other purposes and using them in bathing.

[93] 'Willingly' would mean when he is not forced to do so by the conditions described in 10.81.

[97] 'Without any good qualities' (*viguṇa*) may imply both that the duty is inherently inadequate (involving an impure occupation, for instance) and that one does not do it well. See 6.66 and the almost identical verse in the *Bhagavad Gītā* (3.35). In this verse, the fall 'from caste' that is usually implicit is, for once, explicit.

[102] 'What is purifying' refers to the priest, whom the commentators liken to fire or to Ganges water, which is not defiled by water from the streets.

[105] The story of Ajīgarta's attempt to sacrifice his son, Śunaḥśepha, is told first in the *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa* (7.13–16) and retold many times in ancient India. Though it is true that Ajīgarta is not punished as a criminal, the text certainly depicts him as a most unsavoury character, and his son brutally rejects him when he attempts to 're-adopt' Śunaḥśepha after Śunaḥśepha has become a king.

[106] The myth of the sage (usually called not Vāmadeva but Gautama, which is Vāmadeva's patronymic) who eats dog meat (or the meat of a cow or a human body) during a famine is often connected with the story of Śunaḥśepha (whose name means 'Dog-penis'; see *Mahābhārata* 13.94–5). This theme is a paradigmatic moral dilemma that does, in fact, have evil consequences and is mentioned in ṛg *Veda* 4.18.13.

[107] The story is told in Sāyana's commentary on ṛg *Veda* 6.45.31, where Vṛdhu is the carpenter of the Paṇis, the enemies of the Aryans; see also *Sānkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra* 16.11.11, where his name is Bṛbu. One commentator points out that a carpenter would belong to the 'Unfit' (Āyogava) caste; another says that he is a king.

[108] This, the most famous incident of a sage in distress, is told in the *Mahābhārata* (12.139) and many other texts.

[115] Most of the commentators state that the first three are for all classes, the fourth for rulers, the fifth and sixth for commoners (or the fifth for commoners and the sixth for servants), and the seventh for priests.

[116] These are understood to refer to times of distress. The commentators specify that the knowledge imparted is not Vedic but might include logic, exorcism, magic spells, and so forth. 'Being supported' (*dhṛti*) may also be translated as 'remaining firm', i.e. stiffening the upper lip or making do with little.

[122] The commentators suggest that the word 'priest' should be understood in the context of such a sentence as 'This man is a priest', 'This man is the slave of a priest', 'This man has taken refuge with a priest', or 'This man does the priest's commands.'

CHAPTER 11

[1] A man who wants descendants; one who wants to perform sacrifices; a traveller; a man who has given away all his property for the Veda; (one who begs) for the sake of his guru, his father, his mother, or for the sake of his livelihood as a student of the Veda; and a man consumed with illness – [2] these nine priests should be known as Vedic graduates who beg in accordance with the law, and a gift should be given to these dispossessed men in proportion to their learning. [3] Food, together with a sacrificial gift, should be given to these priests. To others, it is said, food should be given but presented only outside the sacrificial grounds. [4] And a king, as is befitting, should bestow on priests learned in the Veda all kinds of jewels as well as sacrificial gifts for the performance of sacrifices.

[5] A man who already has taken a wife and begs in order to get another wife obtains sexual pleasure as his only reward; for his descendants belong to the man who gave him the money. [6] [But he should, to the best of his ability, bestow riches on distinguished priests learned in the Veda, and after his death he will get to heaven.] [7] A man who has stored away food sufficient to support his dependants for three years or more is entitled to drink Soma. [8] But a twice-born man who has even less means than that and drinks Soma obtains no result from doing so, even if he has drunk Soma before. [9] A man who is capable of giving to other people while his own people are living in misery is a counterfeit of religion: what looks like honey has the taste of poison. [10] Anything that a man does with an eye on the afterlife, and that is done at the expense of his dependants, has an unhappy consequence for him both while he is living and after he dies.

[11] If a patron's sacrifice, and especially one offered by a priest, should be impeded somehow because of (the lack of) one part when there is a just king, [12] the item may be appropriated, so that the sacrifice might be completed, from the household of a commoner who has much livestock but neglects rituals and does not drink Soma. [13] Or, if he likes, he may appropriate two or three things from the house of a servant, for the property of a servant is not his at all when it comes to sacrifices. [14] He may also unhesitatingly raid the household of the man who owns a hundred head of cattle and does not light the sacrificial fires, and of the owner of a thousand head of cattle who does not sacrifice. [15] Or he may take it from a man who always takes and never gives, if that man does not offer it – in this way his fame spreads and his religious merit increases.

[16] Similarly, a man who has not eaten for six meals because he

has undertaken a day-to-day existence can, at the seventh meal, take something from a man who neglects rituals, [*17*] from wherever he finds it – from the granary, the field, or the house – but if he is questioned, he should then confess that (deed) to the man who questions him.

[*18*] A ruler must never take what belongs to a priest; rather, if he has no means to stay alive himself, he should take the property of an alien or of a man who does not perform rituals. [*19*] A man who takes wealth from a wicked man and bestows it on a virtuous man makes himself a boat and delivers both of them. [*20*] Intelligent men know that the property of those who are always engaged in sacrifice belongs to the gods; but the wealth of those who do not sacrifice is said to belong to the demons.

[*21*] A just king should not inflict punishment on him; for it is because of the ruler's irresponsibility that a priest faints with hunger. [*22*] When the king has determined the number of the man's dependants and recognized his canonical learning and his character, he should provide him, out of his (the king's) own household, with a livelihood that will allow him to fulfil his duties. [*23*] And when he has made arrangements for his livelihood, he should protect him in every possible way; for a king obtains the sixth part of the religious merit of the one whom he protects.

[*24*] A priest should never beg from a servant for wealth to be used for the purpose of sacrifice, for the sacrificer who begs (like that) is reborn as a 'Fierce' Untouchable after his death. [*25*] A priest who begs for materials for the sake of sacrifice and does not offer it all up becomes a bird of prey or a crow for a period of a hundred years. [*26*] An evil-hearted man who greedily seizes what belongs to the gods or the priests lives in the next world on the leftovers of vultures.

[*27*] If the prescribed animal sacrifices and Soma sacrifices are left unperformed, for the sake of redemption at the turn of the year one must always make the propitiatory offering of the sacrificial offering called 'For All Men'. [*28*] A twice-born man who fulfils his duty in accordance with the rules for extremities when he is not in extremity does not obtain any reward for it in the next life – that is the considered opinion. [*29*] A substitute for the rule was formulated by the All-Gods, the Amenables, the priests, and the great sages who were afraid of dying in times of extremity. [*30*] It should be known that there will be no reward in the next world for the misguided man who, though capable of following the principal rule, lives according to the secondary rule.

[*31*] A priest who knows the law need not report anything to the king. By means of his own manly power, he may chastise those men

who have wronged him. [*32*] Between his own manly power and the manly power of the king, his own manly power is stronger; therefore a twice-born (priest) may suppress his enemies by means of his own manly power alone. [*33*] He should not hesitate to deploy the revealed canonical texts of the *Atharva Veda*. Speech is the weapon of the priest, and with it a twice-born man can slay his enemies. [*34*] A ruler should get himself through an extremity by means of the manly power of his own two arms, a commoner or servant by means of wealth, but a priest by means of chanting (Vedic verses) and making offerings into the fire. [*35*] The priest is said to be the ordainer, the chastiser, the expounder, and the friend (of all). One should not say improper things to him, nor should one harangue him with empty words.

[*36*] A virgin, a young girl, a man of little learning, a naive man, a man in distress, and a man who has not undergone the transformative rituals should not act as the priest of the oblation of the daily fire sacrifice. [*37*] If those people offer the sacrifice they fall into hell, and so does he to whom the sacrifice belongs. Therefore the priest of the oblation should be someone competent in the ritual of the three sacrificial fires, one who has crossed to the far shore of the Vedas.

[*38*] A priest who, if he owns anything, does not give away a horse dedicated to the Lord of Creatures as a sacrificial gift at the time of the kindling of the sacrificial fires becomes (equal to) someone who has no sacrificial fires. [*39*] A man who is full of faith and has conquered his sensory powers should perform other acts of merit; but he should never offer here on earth sacrifices that are accompanied by meagre sacrificial gifts (to the officiating priests). [*40*] A sacrifice accompanied by a meagre sacrificial gift annihilates the (sacrificer's) sensory powers, fame, heaven, lifespan, renown, progeny, and livestock. Therefore a man with meagre wealth should not sacrifice.

[*41*] A priest who, though a priest of the daily fire sacrifice, intentionally turns his back on his fires should follow the 'Moon-course' vow for a month, for that (act) is equal to homicide. [*42*] Those who receive money from a servant and (use it to) offer a daily fire sacrifice are despised among those who expound the Veda, for they are officiating priests for servants. [*43*] The one who gives (the money) would cross over the dangers by treading with his foot on the head of those ever ignorant men who worship a servant's fire.

[*44*] A man who fails to perform a prescribed act, or commits a disapproved act, or becomes addicted to sensory objects, should perform a restoration. [*45*] Wise men know that a restoration is for an evil committed unintentionally; some say, on the evidence of the revealed canon, it is also for one done intentionally. [*46*] An evil committed unintentionally is cleansed by reciting the Veda, but one

committed intentionally, in confusion, (is cleansed) by different sorts of particular restorations. [*47*] A twice-born man who has incurred the need for restoration, through fate or by an act committed in a former (life), should not associate with good people until the restoration has been completed.

[*48*] Some evil-hearted men undergo a reverse transformation of their form because of evil practices here (in this life), and some because of those committed in a former (life). [*49*] A man who steals gold has mangled fingernails; a man who drinks liquor has discoloured teeth; a priest-killer suffers from consumption; and a man who violates his guru's marriage-bed has a diseased skin. [*50*] A slanderer has a putrid nose; an informer, a putrid mouth; a man who steals grain lacks a part of his body, but an adulterator of grain has a superfluity (of parts of his body). [*51*] A thief of food has indigestion; a thief of words is a mute; a man who steals clothing has white leprosy; and a horse-thief is lame. [*52*] [A man who steals lamps becomes blind, and a man who extinguishes lamps, one-eyed; a sadist is always sick, and an adulterer is rheumatic.] [*53*] Thus, because of the particular effects of their past actions, men who are despised by good people are born idiotic, mute, blind, deaf, and deformed. [*54*] Because of this, a restoration should always be performed for cleansing, since men who have not paid for their guilt are (re) born with distinguishing marks that make them the object of reproach.

[*55*] Killing a priest, drinking liquor, stealing, violating the guru's marriage-bed, and associating with those (who commit these acts) are called the major crimes. [*56*] Lying about one's superior birth, slandering someone to the king, and obstinately displeasing one's guru are equal to priest-killing. [*57*] Discontinuing the study of the Veda, reviling the Veda, giving false evidence, killing a friend, and eating food that is despised or not to be eaten are six (crimes) equal to drinking liquor. [*58*] Stealing a deposit, a man, a horse, silver, land, diamonds, or other gems is traditionally regarded as equal to the theft of gold. [*59*] Discharging semen into women born of the same womb as oneself, virgins, women of the lowest castes, or the wife of one's friend or son, is regarded as equal to the violation of the guru's marriage-bed.

[*60*] Killing a cow, sacrificing for those unfit for the sacrifice, adultery with another man's wife, selling one's self, abandoning one's guru, mother, father, or son, and (abandoning) the private study (of the Veda) and the (domestic sacrificial) fire; [*61*] allowing one's younger brother to marry before one, marrying before one's older brother, giving a daughter to either of those, or sacrificing for them; [*62*] corrupting a virgin, usury, breaking a vow, selling a pool, a pleasure-garden, a wife, or a child; [*63*] living as an outlaw,

abandoning a relative, learning (the Veda) for pay, teaching (the Veda) for pay, selling things that should not be marketed; [64] superintending all kinds of mines, making large machines, injuring medicinal plants, living off one's wife, using magic spells, and performing (magic) rituals involving the use of roots; [65] cutting down green trees for firewood, undertaking acts for one's own sake only, and eating forbidden food; [66] neglecting to kindle the sacrificial fires, stealing, failing to pay debts, studying bad teachings, and working as a travelling bard; [67] stealing grain, base metals, or livestock; having sex with a woman who drinks wine; killing a woman, servant, commoner, or ruler; and professing atheism, are the minor crimes.

[68] Causing an injury to a priest, smelling wine or things that are not to be smelled, crookedness, and sexual union with a man are traditionally said to cause loss of caste. [69] Killing a donkey, horse, camel, deer, elephant, goat, sheep, fish, snake, or buffalo should be recognized as the cause of (sinking to the status of) a mixed caste. [70] Receiving property from reviled people, trading, servility to servants, and telling lies should be recognized as making (the offender) an unworthy receptacle for charity. [71] Killing worms, bugs, or birds; eating food with wine; stealing fruit, firewood, or flowers; and instability cause defilement.

[72] Learn properly the particular vows by which all of these guilts just described are individually expunged.

[73] A priest-killer should build a hut in the forest and live there for twelve years to purify himself, eating food that he has begged for and using the skull of a corpse as his flag. [74] Or he may, by his own wish, make himself the target for knowledgeable armed men; or throw himself three times, head first, into a blazing fire. [75] Or he may offer a horse-sacrifice or (other sacrifices called) 'Heaven-conquering', 'Cow-impelling', 'Wide-conquering', 'All-conquering', 'Triple', or 'Fire-praise'. [76] Or he may walk a thousand miles to dispel the priest-killing, reciting one of the Vedas, eating little, and restraining his sensory powers. [77] Or he may give all that he owns to a priest who knows the Veda, enough property to live on, (or) a house and all its furnishings. [78] Or he may eat food fit for an oblation and walk the length of the Sarasvatī river against the current; or he may restrain his eating and recite one entire collection of a Veda three times.

[79] Or he may shave his head and live on the edge of a village or in a cowpen, or in a hermitage or at the foot of a tree, and take his delight in doing good to cows and priests. [80] Or he may without hesitation give up his life's breath for the sake of a priest or a cow, for anyone who saves a cow or a priest is freed from priest-killing. [91] He is freed by fighting in defence of a priest three times, or by

winning his entire property back for him, or by losing his life's breath for this cause. [*82*] By keeping his vow constantly in this way, chaste and with a concentrated mind, at the end of the twelfth year he dispels his priest-killing.

[*83*] Or he is freed by announcing his own guilt to the gods on earth in an assembly of the gods of men, when he has performed the final bath of ablution in a horse-sacrifice. [*84*] The priest is said to be the root of the law, and the ruler is the tip; therefore he is purified by announcing his guilt in an assembly of these men. [*85*] By his very birth a priest is a deity even for the gods and the only authority for people in this world, for the Veda is the foundation in this matter. [*86*] If even three men who know the Veda declare the thorough redemption of errors, that serves to purify those (errors), for the speech of the learned is a purifier. [*87*] By following any of these rules with a concentrated mind, a priest through his self-mastery dispels the evil created by priest-killing. [*88*] The same vow should be undertaken by anyone who has killed a still-indistinct embryo, a ruler or commoner engaged in a sacrifice, or a woman who has bathed at the end of her menstrual period; [*89*] or by anyone who has told a lie in giving evidence, or stubbornly opposed his guru, or stolen a deposit, or killed a woman or a friend. [*90*] This cleansing has been declared for killing a twice-born man unintentionally; but no redemption is ordained for killing a priest intentionally.

[*91*] A twice-born man so deluded that he has drunk liquor should drink boiling-hot liquor, and when his body has been scalded by it he is freed from that offence. [*92*] Or he may drink boiling-hot cow's urine, water, milk, clarified butter, or liquid cowdung until he dies. [*93*] Or, to dispel (the crime of) drinking liquor, for a year he may eat grains (of rice) or oilcake once a day, at night, wearing a hair-shirt, with his own hair matted, and carrying a flag. [*94*] For liquor is the defiling dirt excreted from rice, and dirt is said to be evil; therefore a priest, ruler, or commoner should not drink liquor. [*95*] Three kinds of liquor should be distinguished: made from sugar, made from ground rice, and made from honey; just as priests should not drink the one, so (they should not drink) any of them.

[*96*] Wine, meat, liquor, and strong decoctions are the food of genies, ogres, and ghouls; a priest who eats the oblation to the gods should not eat that. [*97*] A drunken priest confused by drunkenness might fall on something impure or even pronounce a Vedic text or do something else that should not be done. [*98*] If the Veda that is in his body is even once flooded with wine, his priestliness disappears and he becomes a servant.

[*99*] The various different redemptions for drinking liquor have thus been described; after that I will explain the redemption for

stealing gold.

[*100*] A priest who has stolen gold should go to the king, declare his own act, and said, ‘Sir, punish me.’ [*101*] The king, seizing a club, should himself strike him once; the thief is purified by the corporal or capital punishment, but a priest by mere inner heat. [*102*] A twice-born man who wishes to dispel by inner heat the defilement that comes from stealing gold should wear rags, go to the wilderness, and carry out the vow of a priest-killer.

[*103*] By means of these vows a twice-born man may dispel the evil caused by theft. But he may dispel (the evil of) having sex with his guru’s wife by the following vows:

[*104*] A man who has violated his guru’s marriage-bed should declare his error and sleep on a heated iron bed or embrace a red-hot metal cylinder, and by his death he is cleaned. [*105*] Or he himself may cut off his penis and testicles, hold them in his two cupped hands, and set out toward the southwest region of Ruin, walking straight ahead until he dies. [*106*] Or he may carry a club shaped like a bedpost, wear rags, grow a beard, concentrate his mind, and carry out the ‘Painful’ vow of the Lord of Creatures for a year in a deserted forest. [*107*] Or, to dispel (the crime of violating) his guru’s marriage-bed, he should restrain his sensory powers and carry out the ‘Moon-course’ vow for three months, eating food fit for an oblation or barley-broth.

[*108*] By means of these vows, people who have committed major crimes may dispel their defilement; but people who have committed minor crimes can do it by the following various vows:

[*109*] A man who has committed the minor crime of killing a cow should drink barley(-broth) for a month; he should have his head shaved and live in the cowpen, wrapped in (the cow’s) hide. [*110*] For two months he should restrain his sensory powers and eat very little food, without alkalines or salt, at every fourth mealtime, and bathe in cow’s urine. [*111*] By day he should follow the cows and remain standing, inhaling their dust; by night he should give them obedience and reverence and sit in the heroic posture. [*112*] Restrained and ungrudging, he should stand behind them when they stand, move behind them when they move, and sit when they lie down. [*113*] When a cow is ill, or threatened by danger from thieves, tigers, and so forth, or has fallen down or got stuck in the mud, he should free her (even) by (giving up) his whole life’s breath. [*114*] In the heat, or rain, or cold, or strong wind, he should not make a shelter for himself until he has made one for the cow, to the best of his ability. [*115*] If a cow eats or a calf drinks in his own or anyone else’s house, field, or granary, he should not tell. [*116*] If a man who has killed a cow

follows a cow in this way, in three months he dispels the evil caused by cow-killing. [*117*] And when he has properly fulfilled this vow he should give ten cows and a bull to men who know the Vedas, and if he does not have them, (he should give) all he has.

[*118*] Twice-born men who have committed a minor crime, except for someone who has shed his semen in violation of a vow, should carry out the same vow (as for cow-killing) or the 'Moon-course' vow, to become clean. [*119*] But a man who has shed his semen in violation of a vow should sacrifice a one-eyed donkey to Ruin at a crossroads at night, according to the rules for the domestic sacrifice. [*120*] He should make an oblation into the fire in accordance with the rules and then offer oblations of melted butter to the Wind, Indra, the Guru, and Fire, while reciting the verse that begins, 'All over me'. [*121*] When a twice-born man who has undertaken a vow sheds his semen out of lust, those who understand the law and expound the Veda call that a violation of the vow. [*122*] The brilliant energy of the Veda in a man who has undertaken a vow goes, if he has shed his semen, into four gods: the Wind, Indra the much-invoked, the Guru, and Fire. [*123*] If this error is committed, he should put on the skin of a donkey and go begging from seven houses, proclaiming his own act. [124] Living on the food that he has begged from them once a day, washing at sunrise, noon, and sunset, after a year he becomes clean.

[*125*] Anyone who intentionally commits any of the acts that cause a loss of caste should carry out the '(Painful) Heating' vow, or if unintentionally, the 'Painful' vow of the Lord of Creatures. [*126*] For acts that degrade one to the status of a mixed caste and for those that make (the offender) an unworthy receptacle for charity, the cleansing is the 'Moon-course' vow for a month; and for acts that cause defilement, he should be scalded with barley-broth for three days.

[*127*] One fourth of (the punishment for) priest-killing is traditionally regarded as (the punishment) for the killing of a ruler, one eighth for (killing) a commoner, and it should be one sixteenth for (killing) a servant who knows his place. [*128*] But if a priest kills a ruler unintentionally, he should give a thousand cows and a bull after he has properly fulfilled his vow. [*129*] Or he may spend three years carrying out the vow of a priest-killer, restraining his sensory powers, wearing his hair matted, and living at the foot of a tree far from a village. [*130*] If a priest has killed a commoner who knows his place he should carry out this very same restoration for a year, or he may give a hundred cows and a bull. [*131*] A man who has killed a servant should carry out all of this very same vow for six months, or he may give ten white cows and a bull to a priest.

[*132*] If a man kills a cat or a mongoose, a blue jay, a frog, a dog, a lizard, an owl, or a crow, he should carry out the vow for killing a

servant; [133] or he may drink milk for three nights, or walk a ten-mile road, or wash in a flowing river, or recite the hymn in which the Waters are the deity. [134] If a priest kills a snake, he should give a black iron spade to a priest; for (killing) an impotent man, a load of straw and a 'small bean' of lead; [135] for a boar, a pot of clarified butter; for a partridge, a bucket of sesame seeds; for a parrot, a two-year-old calf; for a curlew, a three-year-old (calf); [136] for killing a goose, a crane, a heron, a peacock, a monkey, a falcon, or a vulture, he should give a cow. [137] For killing a horse, he should give a garment; for an elephant, five black bulls; for a goat or sheep, a draught ox; for a donkey, a one-year-old (calf). [138] But for killing carnivorous wild animals he should give a milk-cow, and for non-carnivores, a heifer; for a camel, a 'berry'. [139] To become clean after killing an unchaste woman of any of the four classes a man should give a leather bag, a bow, a billy-goat, or a sheep, individually according to the class. [140] If a twice-born man cannot wash away the killing of the snake and so forth by giving gifts, he should carry out a 'Painful' vow for each one, to dispel the evil.

[141] But for killing a thousand creatures with bones, or an entire wagonload of creatures without bones, he should carry out the vow for killing a servant. [142] For killing those with bones he should give something to a priest; and for injuring those without bones he is cleaned by suppressing his breath. [143] For cutting fruit trees, shrubs, vines, creepers, or flowering plants, a thousand Vedic verses should be chanted. [144] For (destroying) all sorts of creatures born in foods like rice, in liquids, or in fruits or flowers, eating clarified butter is the cleansing. [145] For pulling up, for no purpose, medicinal herbs grown by tillage or growing by themselves in the forest, a man should follow after a cow for one day, living on nothing but milk.

[146] These vows can dispel all of the guilt that comes from perpetrating violence, knowingly or unknowingly. Now listen to (the vows of restoration for) eating things that should not be eaten.

[147] If a man drinks date-palm wine unknowingly, he is cleaned only by another transformative ritual (of initiation); (even) if it is done knowingly, the loss of the life's breath should not be decreed; this is a fixed rule. [148] A man who drinks water that has been kept in a liquor jar or a wine jug should, for five nights, drink milk boiled with a conch-shell flower. [149] If he has touched an intoxicating drink or given it or received it in accordance with the rules, or if he has drunk water left over by a servant, for three days he should drink water (purified) with sacrificial grass. [150] But when a priest who drinks Soma smells the odour of a liquor-drinker, he is cleaned by suppressing his breath three times in water and by eating clarified butter.

[*151*] Men of the three twice-born classes who have unknowingly swallowed excrement or urine or anything that has been touched by liquor should undergo the transformative ritual (of initiation) again. [*152*] But in this second celebration of the transformative ritual of the twice-born, the shaving of the head, the belt, the staff, the begging for food, and the vows should be omitted. [*153*] A man who has eaten the food of people whose food should not be eaten, or the leftovers of a woman or servant, or who has devoured meat that should not be eaten, should drink barley (-broth) for seven nights. [*154*] If a twice-born man drinks sour or astringent (fluids), even if they are pure, he is not purified until they have passed through him. [*155*] If a twice-born man has eaten the urine or excrement of a dung-heap pig, a donkey, a camel, a jackal, a monkey, or a crow, he should carry out the 'Moon-course' vow. [*156*] If he has eaten dried meats, mushrooms growing on the ground, or something of an unknown nature from a slaughter-house, he should carry out the very same vow. [*157*] For eating carnivorous animals, pigs, camels, cocks, men, crows, and donkeys, the cleansing is the 'Hot Painful' vow.

[*158*] If a twice-born man who has not returned home (from his time of study) eats the food given at the monthly (funeral ceremony), he should fast for three days and spend one day in water. [*159*] But if a man who is carrying out a vow should ever eat meat or honey, he should carry out an ordinary 'Painful' vow before he completes the rest of his own vow. [*160*] Anyone who has eaten the leavings of a cat, crow, rat, dog, or mongoose, or food in which a hair or a bug has fallen, should drink (a decoction of) holy rue. [*161*] Anyone who wishes to keep himself clean should not eat food that is not to be eaten, but he should vomit up anything that he eats unknowingly or quickly make himself clean by the means of cleansing.

[*162*] The varied rule for the vows for eating what should not be eaten has thus been described; now learn the rule for the vows that steal away the fault of theft.

[*163*] If a priest has intentionally stolen grain, food, or property right out of the house of someone of the same caste, he is cleaned by carrying out the 'Painful' vow for a year. [*164*] For stealing men or women, a field or a house, or the water from a well or a long pond, the 'Moon-course' vow is traditionally regarded as the cleansing. [*165*] If someone steals articles of little value from someone else's house, he should return them and carry out the 'Painful Heating' vow to make himself clean. [*166*] For stealing raw or cooked food, a carriage, bed, or seat, flowers, roots, or fruits, the cleansing is (swallowing) the five cow-products. [*167*] For (stealing) grass, wood, trees, dry food, sugar, clothing, leather, or meat, one should go without food for three nights. [*168*] For (stealing) gems, pearls, coral, copper, silver, iron,

brass, or stone, one's only food for twelve days should be dry grains. [*169*] For (stealing) cotton, silk, wool, an animal with cloven hooves or one with a whole hoof, a bird, perfume, medicinal herbs, or a rope, (one should live) on milk for three days.

[*170*] With these vows a twice-born man may dispel the evil caused by theft; with the following vows he may dispel (the evil of) having sex with women that one should not have sex with.

[*171*] If a man has shed his semen in women born of the same womb as himself, with the wife of his friend or his son, with virgins or women of the lowest castes, he should carry out the vow for (violating) the guru's marriage-bed. [*172*] If he has sex with the 'sister' who is the daughter of his father's sister, or with the daughter of his mother's sister or of his mother's full brother, he should carry out the 'Moon-course' vow. [*173*] An intelligent man should not take any of these three for his wife; he should not have sex with them because they are relatives, and if he had sex with them he would fall low. [*174*] If a man has shed his semen in non-human females, in a man, in a menstruating woman, in something other than a vagina, or in water, he should carry out the 'Painful Heating' vow.

[*175*] If a twice-born man unites sexually with a man or a woman in a cart pulled by a cow, or in water, or by day, he should bathe with his clothes on. [*176*] If a priest unknowingly has sex with 'Fierce' Untouchable women or very low-caste women, eats (their food) or accepts (gifts from them), he falls if knowingly, he becomes their equal. [*177*] If a woman has been corrupted by a priest, her husband should imprison her in a single room and have her carry out the vow for a man who has slept with another man's wife. [*178*] But if she is seduced by a man of the same class (as hers) and badly corrupted again, the purification for her is traditionally said to be the 'Painful' and the 'Moon-course' vow. [*179*] A twice-born man who spends a single night having sex with a servant woman dispels that (guilt) by eating food that he has begged for and chanting (the Veda) constantly for three years.

[*180*] The redemption for four kinds of evil-doers has thus been described; now learn the following redemptions for people who associate with those who have fallen.

[*181*] A man falls himself if he associates with a fallen man for a year by performing sacrifices for him, teaching him, or forming a marriage alliance with him, but not (just) by sharing a carriage, a seat, or a meal with him. [*182*] A man who forms a connection with any of these fallen men should carry out the same vow as his in order to clean up that connection. [*183*] The co-feeding relatives and maternal relatives of a fallen man should make a funeral libation of water to

him outside (the village) on the evening of an inauspicious day, in the presence of a paternal relative, an officiating priest, and a guru. [*184*] A female slave should overturn a pot full of a water with her foot, as if it were for a dead person; they and the relatives remain polluted for a day and a night. [*185*] They should no longer converse or sit with him, or give him his inheritance and so forth, or have any ordinary casual contact with him. [*186*] His primogeniture must cease, along with the wealth that should belong to the eldest, and a younger brother who excels him in qualities should get his share that belongs to the eldest.

[*187*] But when the restoration has been carried out, they should overturn a new pot full of water and bathe together with him in an excellent pool of water. [*188*] And he should throw that pot into the water and enter his own house and perform all the duties of a relative, just as before. [*189*] This same rule should also be applied to fallen women, but they should be given clothes, food, and water, and they should live near the house. [*190*] One should have nothing to do with people who have committed errors and have not been washed, but one should in no way have disgust for those who have been washed. [*191*] And one should not live with ingrates or with people who have killed children, women, or those who have come to them for refuge, even if they have been cleaned in accordance with the law.

[*192*] If twice-born men have not been taught the verse to the sun-god in accordance with the rule, they should be made to carry out three 'Painful' vows and be initiated in accordance with the rule. [*193*] And if twice-born men persist in the wrong activities and wish to carry out a restoration, or if they have given up learning the Veda, they too should be taught to carry out the same (vow). [*194*] Priests who have acquired property by a despicable activity are cleaned by giving it up, chanting (the Veda), and generating inner heat. [*195*] A man is freed from (the guilt of) receiving a gift from a bad person when he has chanted the verse to the sun-god three thousand times with a concentrated mind and lived for a month in the cowpen, drinking milk. [*196*] But when he comes back from the cowpen, emaciated from his fast, and bows low, they should ask him, 'My dear sir, do you wish to be (our) equal?' [*197*] He should tell the priests the truth and scatter fodder for the cows; and in that watering place established by the cows they should receive him back.

[*198*] A man who has sacrificed for outlaws or performed the final ritual for strangers, or a magic spell, or the several-day sacrifice, may dispel (the guilt) by three 'Painful' vows. [*199*] A twice-born man who has deserted someone who came to him for refuge, or who has publicly spread the Veda, dissipates that evil by eating barley for a year. [*200*] A man who has been bitten by a dog, a jackal, a donkey,

or by village carnivores, by a man, a horse, a camel, or a pig, is cleaned by suppressing his breath. [*201*] Those who do not belong in the rows may be cleaned by eating only at every sixth mealtime for a month, or by chanting an entire collection of a Veda and making the 'fragmentary' oblations every day. [*202*] If a priest intentionally rides in a carriage drawn by camels or by donkeys, or if he bathes wearing nothing but sky, he is cleaned by suppressing his breath. [*203*] If a man who is physically distressed should void a bodily substance without using water, or into water, he is cleaned by plunging into water outside (the village) with his clothes on and touching a cow. [*204*] If a man neglects the daily rituals prescribed by the Veda or fails to fulfil the vows of a Vedic graduate, fasting is the restoration.

[*205*] If a man says 'Hush!' to a priest, or uses the familiar form of 'you' to someone more important, he should bathe, fast for the rest of the day, and appease the person by addressing him with reverence. [*206*] If he strikes (a priest), even if it is only with a blade of grass, or ties him around the neck with a cloth, or wins against him in an argument, he should appease him by prostrating himself before him. [*207*] But a man who has threatened a priest with intent to injure him goes to hell for a hundred years; if he strikes him, a thousand years. [*208*] As many grains of dust as the blood coagulates on the ground, for so many thousands of years will the man who shed it live in hell. [*209*] For threatening a priest, a man should carry out a 'Painful' vow; for knocking him down, an 'Extra-painful' vow; for shedding his blood, a 'Painful' and an 'Extra-painful' vow. [*210*] But in order to dispel evils for which no redemption has been declared, one should devise a restoration taking into consideration the evil and the ability (of the evil-doer).

[*211*] I will tell you the methods used by the gods, sages, and ancestors, by which methods a human being drags away guilt.

[*212*] A twice-born man who carries out (the 'Painful' vow, which is called the vow of) the Lord of Creatures, should eat in the morning for three days, then in the evening for three days; for three days (he should eat) food that he has not asked for, and for the next three days he should not eat. [*213*] The 'Painful Heating' vow is traditionally said to consist of cow's urine, cowdung, milk, yogurt, melted butter, water infused with sacrificial grass, and a fast of one night. [*214*] A twice-born man who carries out an 'Extra-Painful' vow should eat for three periods of three days as stated before, but only one mouthful at each meal, and he should fast for the last three days. [*215*] A priest who carries out a 'Hot Painful' vow should drink, for three days each, hot water, hot milk, hot clarified butter, and hot air, and bathe once with a concentrated mind. [*216*] If a man goes without food for twelve days, controlling himself and making no careless mistakes, it is the

'Painful' vow called 'Distancing', which dispels all evils. [*217*] When a man decreases his food by one ball every day of the dark (lunar fortnight), and increases it during the bright (lunar fortnight), and washes at sunrise, noon, and sunset, that is traditionally regarded as the 'Moon-course' vow. [*218*] A man should follow the same rule of the 'Moon-course' vow throughout in the 'Barley-middle' vow, but begin his restraint in the bright lunar fortnight. [*219*] A man who carries out the 'Ascetic's Moon-course' vow should restrain himself and eat nothing but food fit for an oblation, eight balls at every noon. [*220*] When a priest with concentrated mind eats four balls of food at dawn and four when the sun sets, that is traditionally regarded as the 'Child's Moon-course' vow.

[*221*] A man who, with concentrated mind, eats thrice eighty balls of food fit for an oblation in any manner over the course of a month, shares the world of the moon (when he dies). [*222*] Thé Rudras, Ādityas, Vasus, and Maruts, together with the great sages, practised this vow to be freed from everything inauspicious. [*223*] He himself should make an oblation every day, accompanied by the three great exclamations, and live with non-violence, truth, lack of anger, and straightforwardness. [*224*] He should submerge himself in water with his clothes on three times a day and three times a night, and he should never talk with women, servants, or fallen people. [*225*] He should pass the time by standing and sitting, or, if he cannot do that, he may lie down; he should remain chaste and keep his vow, revering his guru, the gods, and the twice-born. [*226*] He should constantly chant the verse to the sun-god and the purifying texts, to the best of his ability, carefully and in the same way in every single vow for the purpose of restoration.

[*227*] Twice-born men whose errors have been revealed should be cleaned by these vows; but those whose evils have not been revealed should be cleaned by Vedic verses and oblations. [*228*] An evil-doer is freed from his evil by declaring (the act), by remorse, by inner heat, by recitation (of the Veda), and, in extremity, by giving gifts. [*229*] The more a man of his own accord declares the wrong that he has done, the more he is freed from that wrong, like a snake from its skin. [*230*] The more his mind-and-heart despises the evil action that he has committed, the more his body is freed from that wrong. [*231*] For a man who has done evil and felt remorse is set free from that evil, but he is purified by ceasing (to do it, with the resolution), 'I will not do that again.' [*232*] When he has considered in this way in his mind-and-heart what fruits will spring forth from the effects of his past actions when he has died, he should constantly engage in auspicious actions in his mind-and-heart, speech, and physical form. [*233*] If a man who has knowingly or unknowingly committed a despicable

action wishes to be freed from it, he should not do it a second time.

[*234*] If his mind-and-heart is heavy because of some act that he has committed, he should generate the inner heat (prescribed) for it until he is satisfied. [*235*] The intelligent men whose vision was the Veda said that all this happiness of gods and humans has inner heat as its root, inner heat as its middle, and inner heat as its end. [*236*] Knowledge is a priest's inner heat, protection a ruler's inner heat, business a commoner's inner heat, and service a servant's inner heat. [*237*] The self-controlled sages who eat fruits, roots, and air look over the triple world, with everything moving and still, by means of inner heat alone. [*238*] Medicinal herbs, sound health, learning, and the various divine statuses are achieved by inner heat alone, for inner heat is the way to achieve them. [*239*] Whatever is hard to pass over, hard to get, hard to reach, or hard to do, all of that can be achieved by inner heat, for inner heat is hard to surpass. [*240*] Those who have committed major crimes and all the rest who have done what should not be done are freed from that guilt by well-generated inner heat. [*241*] Worms, snakes, moths, livestock, and birds, as well as living beings that are stationary, go to heaven by the strength of their inner heat. [*242*] Whatever guilt people incur in mind-and-heart, speech, or action, they quickly burn all that away with inner heat alone, for inner heat is their wealth. [*243*] The gods who live in heaven accept the sacrificial offerings of the priest who has been cleaned by inner heat alone, and they fulfil his desires. [*244*] By inner heat alone the god who is the Lord of Creatures emitted this teaching, and in the very same way the sages obtained the Vedas by generating inner heat. [*245*] Seeing that the excellent origin of this entire (universe) was from inner heat, the gods have proclaimed that this great good fortune comes from inner heat.

[*246*] Daily study of the Veda, performance of the great sacrifices according to one's ability, and patience quickly de stroy evils, even those caused by the major crimes. [*247*] Just as fire instantly burns up the fuel that it touches with its brilliant energy, so a man who knows the Veda burns up all evil with the fire of his knowledge.

[*248*] The restoration for (revealed) errors in accordance with the rules has thus been described; after that, learn the restoration for secret (errors).

[*249*] Even the killer of an embryo is purified after a month by suppressing his breath sixteen times together with (recitation of) the three great exclamations and the syllable 'Om', repeated day after day. [*250*] Even a man who has drunk liquor is cleaned by chanting the hymn of Kutsa that begins, 'Burn away our error', the hymn of Vasistha that begins, 'With hymns of praise they woke the dawn', the hymn that begins, 'Great is the help of the three', and the verses that

contain the word, 'clean'. [*251*] Even a man who has stolen gold becomes instantly free of defilement by once chanting the hymn that begins, 'This beloved grey priest', and the 'Auspicious Intention'. [*252*] A man who has violated his guru's marriage-bed is freed by reciting the hymns that begin, 'Drink the oblation', 'Let no anxiety', and 'This, yes, this is my thought: have I not drunk Soma?' and reciting the 'Hymn of Man'. [*253*] A man who wishes to dispel gross or subtle errors should chant for a year the verse that begins 'Let us dispel your rage', or (the one that begins) 'If we humans have committed some offence'. [*254*] A man who has received gifts from someone whose gifts should not be received or has eaten despicable food is purified by chanting the verses that begin, 'Swiftly this exhilarating stream flows', for three days. [*255*] But a man who has committed many errors is cleaned by repeating for a year the verses to Soma and Rudra and the verses that begin, 'Aryaman, Varuṇa, and Mitra', while bathing in a flowing stream. [*256*] A man who has erred should chant for a year the seven verses that begin, 'We call to Indra for help'; but a man who has done something forbidden in water should sit for a month, eating food that he has begged for. [*257*] A twice-born man dispels even a very grave error by offering an oblation of clarified butter with the Vedic verses of the 'fragmentary' oblations for a year or by chanting the verse that begins, 'Bowing low is powerful'.

[*258*] A man who has committed a major crime is cleaned if he follows after cows for a year with a concentrated mind, reciting the hymns to purified Soma and eating food that he has begged for. [*259*] Or he is freed from all crimes if, purified, he recites an entire collection of the Veda three times in the wilderness and is cleaned by three 'Distancing' vows. [*260*] But if a man fasts diligently for three days and goes down into the water three times a day, chanting the 'Error-erasing Hymn', he is freed from all crimes. [*261*] Just as the horse-sacrifice, the king of sacrifices, dispels all evil, even so the 'Error-erasing Hymn' dispels all evil.

[*262*] A priest who retains the ṛg *Veda* in his memory incurs no guilt at all, even if he destroys these three worlds or eats food taken from anyone whatever. [*263*] Anyone who, with a concentrated mind, recites three times the collection of the ṛg *Veda*, or of the *Yajur Veda* or the *Sāma Veda*, together with the secret texts, is freed from all evils. [*264*] Just as a clod of earth disintegrates when it is thrown into a great lake, even so all evil-doing sinks away in the three-fold Veda. [*265*] The verses, the other formulas, and the various chants – this should be known as the three-fold Veda, and a man who knows this is a man who knows the Veda. [*266*] The primary, ultimate reality, consisting of three sounds, on which the triple (Veda) is based, is another three-fold Veda which must be kept secret, and a man who

knows that is a man who knows the Veda.

End of Chapter 11

[1] The man who wants descendants goes begging in order to finance his wedding, as in 11.5. The commentators suggest that the 'man who has given all his property away for the Veda' has given everything up at a sacrifice or to a teacher.

[6] This verse, which is almost certainly an interpolation, is rightly omitted from Dave's edition, as is 11.52, though Bühler and most other editions include them. Both have been retained in this translation, in brackets (indicating their dubious status), in order to facilitate cross-reference to other editions and to Bühler's critical apparatus.

[14] The verse as a whole seems to refer to wealthy men of all social classes. The second half of the verse appears to refer to the wealthy man who does not offer a Soma sacrifice.

[19] Literally, he causes them both to cross over (*saṃtārayati*), presumably to cross over the ocean of misfortune. One commentator suggests that he delivers the man from whom he takes the money both by saving him the trouble of protecting his wealth and by keeping him from an evil fate after death.

[21] 'Him' refers to the man who takes property under the conditions described in 11.12–19.

[27] The offering 'For All Men' is the *vaiśvānarī*.

[33] The *Atharva Veda* (referred to here as the texts of Atharvan and Angiras) is a collection of magic incantations, some malevolent.

[36] The priest of the oblation is the *hotṛ*.

[41] The 'Moon-course' vow is described in 11.217.

[43] The dangers of hell are what the servant will avoid by paying the priest to do the sacrifice.

[49] A very similar list of undesirables appears at 3.153, in the list of people not to be invited to a ceremony for the dead.

[51] The thief of words is not a plagiarist but one who learns the Veda without permission to do so.

[52] Literally, an adulterer's body is afflicted with an excess of wind, one of the three humours. There is much confusion in the manuscripts about this verse, and many commentators omit it, as does Dave; it is included here, bracketed, like 11.6. The last line in the version used here reads *hiṃsāruciḥ sadā rogī vātāngaḥ pāradārikaḥ*.

[55] These crimes, called *pātakas*, are more precisely those crimes that cause one to fall (*pat*) from caste and into hell.

[60] Selling oneself into slavery is meant here.

[61] For the marriages of the older and younger brother (*parivitti* and *parivettṛ*), see 3.154, 170–72.

[64] 'Living off one's wife' may also mean 'living off a woman'. For another pejorative reference to the use of roots, see 10.38.

[66] The debts may be any debts or the three debts owed to gods, sages, and ancestors. The word for travelling bard, *kuśīlava*, can also denote an actor, singer, or dancer.

[68] Some commentators specify that the male homosexual act ('sticking in the penis') takes place in the mouth and so forth, others in the anus and so forth.

[74] 'Knowledgeable' may either mean that they know that he is a priest-killer carrying out an act of penance, or that they are archers who know how to shoot well (in battle, some commentators add).

[75] These sacrifices are the *svarjit, gosava, abhijit, viśvajit, trivṛt*, and *agniṣṭut*. Some commentators take 'Heaven-conquering' and 'Triple' not as separate sacrifices but as adjectives for the sacrifices mentioned after them.

[76] He walks a hundred *yojanas*, and a *yojana* (literally, a 'yoking', the distance that one can travel without unyoking the horses) is about ten miles.

[83] The gods of men are the rulers, and the gods on earth are the priests.

[92] These are four of the five cow-products. See 11.66.

[93] The flag presumably has the sign of the wine-shop on it, as in 9.237. The hair-shirt (*vālavāsas*) is more precisely made from the hair of the tail of a horse or cow.

[95] *Paiṣṭī*, the liquor made from rice (which is referred to as *anna* in 11.94), is the most potent and therefore the worst; but the same rules apply to the other two, one made from sugar or molasses (*gauḍi*), and the other from honey or from the flowers of the honey-tree (*madhvī*).

[101] The club is carried to the king by the thief, as we learn from 8.314–16. The commentators are quite troubled by this verse, which seems to allow for the possibility that the king may kill a priest. They argue variously that the corporal or capital punishment (*vadha*) is merely a blow, not fatal, or that the text distinguishes between the thief whom the king may kill, who is not in fact a priest, and the thief who is purified by mere inner heat, who is a priest. This latter interpretation is supported by some manuscripts that read 'or' in place of 'but' ('or a priest may purify himself by inner heat').

[104] The cylinder is said to be shaped in the image of a woman. The guru's wife may simply be the wife of one's revered teacher, but may also denote the wife of any closely related and respected male, particularly one's father. The crime is therefore tantamount to incest.

[105] Ruin (*nirṛti*), personified, is a goddess who presides over the southwest.

[106] The commentators say that this vow (explained in 11.212) expiates incest with one's father's wife, or a stepmother (who is, according to some commentators, not among the women to whom 11.104 applies). Some commentators say that it applies only when one has mistaken her for one's own wife, others that it applies when one does it knowingly, out of lust. The *khatvānga* club that is often carried by ascetics has a skull on the top, which gives it the shape of a bedpost; it is regarded as one of the weapons of the god Śiva. This symbol connects Śiva with the Lord of Creatures, Prajāpati, said to be the author of this vow, in an appropriate way: Śiva punished Prajāpati for committing incest (with his daughter) by beheading him, and that skull, which stuck fast to Śiva, is the paradigm for the 'bedpost club'.

[107] The 'Moon-course' vow is defined at 11.217.

[111] The heroic posture, or *vīrāsana*, is a yogic position: squatting on one's thighs with the lower legs crossed over one another.

[120] The verse (*Taittirīya Āraṇyaka* 2.18.4) goes, 'All over me, over Indra, over Bṛhaspati, let the storm gods pour down.' The Guru is Bṛhaspati, the Guru of the Gods.

[123] The commentary suggests that the donkey sacrificed in 11.119 supplies the skin.

[125] The 'Painful Heating' vow (*sāntapana*) is described at 11.213; the 'Painful' vow of the Lord of Creatures is described at 11.212.

[129] See 11.73 and 11.79.

[133] The commentaries identify the hymn to the waters as ṛg *Veda* 10.9. See 8.106.

[134] The phrase 'to a priest' has been moved from 11.136 to the beginning of the list, in 11.134. One commentator on this verse says that there are four kinds of impotent men (*ṣaṇḍas*): a man who has no seed, whose seed is blighted, whose sensory organs do not function, or who manifests both (sets of sexual organs). A 'small bean' (*māṣaka*) is five grains; see 8.135.

[139] The commentaries explain that the leather bag is given for the killing of a woman of the priestly class, the bow for the woman of the ruling class, the billy-goat for the commoner woman, and the sheep for the servant woman.

[148] The conch-shell flower, *śankhapuṣpi*, is the Andropogon Aciculatus.

[157] The 'Hot Painful' vow (*taptakṛcchra*) is described in 11.215.

[161] The means of cleansing (*śodhanas*) might be vows of restoration or physical purgatives.

[166] The five cow-products are milk, yogurt, butter, and the urine and excrement of a cow.

[173] He might fall from caste or fall into hell, or both.

[174] The commentators point out that the female animal might be a mare or a ewe, but not a cow, intercourse with whom would be more severely punished, as the equivalent of violating the guru's marriage-bed; that the places other than the vagina might be his own wife's mouth, anus, or hand, and so forth; that 'in water' might also mean 'when having intercourse with a woman in water'.

[177] The commentaries and translators all take *vipraduṣṭa* as *vi-praduṣṭa*, 'perversely corrupted' or 'exceedingly corrupt' (Bühler), since *praduṣṭa* occurs alone in the next verse. Yet it is also possible to divide the compound as *vipra-duṣṭa*, 'corrupted by a priest', especially since *vipra* in that sense has just occurred in the preceding verse and the following verse also refers to a punishment that depends on the class of the seducer.

[180] The four evil-doers are people who have committed the four major crimes that cause a fall: killing, eating the wrong food, stealing, and having sex with forbidden women.

[192] The proper time to learn the verse to the sun-god is discussed at 2.38.

[198] The several-day sacrifice is the *ahīna*, a Soma sacrifice that may last for between two and twelve days.

[201] The 'rows' are the rows of priests at a ceremony for the dead, which define acceptable society; see 3.151ff. The 'fragmentary' (*śākala*) oblations are those that are accompanied by eight verses (*Vājasaneyī Saṃhitā* 8.13) of the Sākala school of the Veda.

[205] 'Hush!' (*hum*) means many things in Sanskrit, including 'Boo!', but one commentator on this verse suggests that in this case it means, 'Be quiet and don't talk like that.'

[206] This verse and the next two are slightly different versions of 4.166, 165, and 168.

[209] The 'Extra-painful' vow is described at 11.214.

[212] This is the *kṛcchra* vow.

[213] This is the *kṛcchrasāntapana* vow, which includes the five cow-products.

[214] This is the *atikṛcchra* vow.

[215] This is the *taptakṛcchra* vow.

[216] This is the *parāka* vow.

[217] This is the *cāndrāyaṇa* vow. The ball (*piṇḍa*) of food is the amount that a rice-eater rolls together with a ball of rice and then swallows, the equivalent of a mouthful; it is also the word for the ball of rice that is offered to the ancestors at the ceremony for the dead.

[218] The regular 'Moon-course' vow is said to be ant-shaped (we might say hour-glass shaped), because the fast days (the lean days) come in the middle of the lunar month. The 'Barley-middle' (*yavamadhyama*) vow is shaped like a rounded barley-corn because the fat days come in the middle of the lunar month.

[219] This is the *yaticāndrāyaṇa* vow.

[220] This is the *śiśucāndrāyaṇa* vow.

[222] The Rudras and Maruts are groups of storm gods; the Ādityas and Vasus are groups of solar gods.

[223] For the three great exclamations, see 2.77–8, 81.

[226] Several purifying texts from the Veda are specified at 11.250–60.

[241] The commentators refer to the 'Tale of the Worm' and the 'Conversation with a Dove' (told in the *Mahābhārata* at 13.118–20 and 12.141–7, respectively), in which a worm goes through a series of transmigrations and is ultimately Freed, and a male and female dove commit suicide and are reunited in heaven, all through the power of

their inner heat.

[250] These hymns, attributed to the various sages who 'saw' them, are ṛg *Veda* 1.97, 7.80, 10.185 (the *māhitra*), and 8.95.7–9.

[251] The first text is ṛg *Veda* 1.164 (the *asya vāmasya*), and the 'Auspicious Intention' (*sivasaṃkalpa*) is *Vājasaneyī Saṃhitā* 32.1–6 or 34.1.

[252] ṛg *Veda* 10.88, 10.126, 10.119, and 10.90 (the *puruṣa-sūkta*).

[253] ṛg *Veda* 1.24.14 and 7.89.5.

[254] ṛg *Veda* 9.58.

[255] ṛg *Veda* 6.74.1–4 and 4.2.4–6. Aryaman is a minor deity closely associated with Varuṇa.

[256] The verses are ṛg *Veda* 1.106.1–7. The commentators suggest that the acts forbidden in water might be having sex, emitting urine or excrement, or eating forbidden food.

[257] For the 'fragmentary' Vedic verses see 11.201. The Vedic verse is ṛg *Veda* 6.51.8.

[258] The Soma hymns are the whole of the ninth book of the ṛg *Veda*, sung while the Soma is purified by being strained through a sieve.

[260] The hymn, ṛg *Veda* 10.190, is sometimes said to have been revealed to a sage named 'Error-eraser' (*aghamarṣaṇa*).

[263] The secret texts are the Upaniṣads appended to each Veda.

[265] The 'other' formulas (*yajus*) are those which are not included in the verses (*ṛg*) in the ṛg *Veda* but are found only in the *Yajur Veda*.

[266] The three sounds are the elements of 'Om'.

CHAPTER 12

[*1*] 'Unerring one, you have described the whole law of the four class (system); now teach us, accurately, the ultimate culmination of the fruits of actions.' [*2*] Bhṛgu the descendant of Manu, the soul of religion, said this in reply to the great sages:

Listen to the final conclusion about the whole performance of actions.

[*3*] The action that arises in the mind-and-heart, speech, and the body bears good and bad fruits; the highest, lowest, and middle levels of men's existences come from their actions. [*4*] Know that the mind-and-heart sets in motion the body's (action) here on earth, which is of three kinds and has three bases and ten distinctive marks. [*5*] The three kinds of mental action are thinking too much about things that belong to others, meditating in one's mind-and-heart about what is undesirable, and adhering to falsehoods. [*6*] The four kinds of speech (acts) are verbal abuse, lies, slander of all sorts, and unbridled chatter. [*7*] The three kinds of bodily (action) are traditionally said to be taking things that have not been given, committing violence against the law, and having sex with another man's wife. [*8*] A man experiences in his mind-and-heart the good or bad effects of past actions committed in his mind-and-heart, in his speech what he has committed in his speech, and in his body what he has committed with his body. [*9*] A man becomes a stationary object as a result of the faults that are the effects of past actions of the body, a bird or wild animal from those of speech, and a member of one of the lowest castes from those of the mind-and-heart. [*10*] A man is said to have a 'triple rod' if he has established in his consciousness the rod that enforces the mind-and-heart, the rod that enforces speech, and the rod that enforces the body. [*11*] The man who wields this triple rod among all living beings and thoroughly suppresses his lust and anger thereby achieves success.

[*12*] They say that the one who causes this (physical) self to act is the knower of the field, but intelligent men say that the one who actually performs the actions is the elemental self. [*13*] Another internal self that is born with all who have bodies is called the living soul, through which (the knower of the field) knows all happiness and unhappiness in (successive) births. [*14*] These two, the great one and the knower of the field, endure, thoroughly intermingled with the elements and pervading the one who endures in high and low living beings. [*15*] Innumerable physical forms go forth out of his body and constantly set high and low living beings in motion.

[*16*] After the death of men who have done bad deeds, another

solid body, designed to be tortured, is born out of the five elements. [17] When (the living souls) here have suffered with that body the tortures given by Yama, (the bodies) dissolve, each part distributed into its own basic element. [18] And after he has suffered for the faults that are born of attachment to the sensory objects and that result in unhappiness, his stains are erased and he approaches the two who have great energy. [19] Those two together tirelessly watch his religious merit and his evil, for it is through being thoroughly intermingled with that pair that he attains happiness or unhappiness here on earth and after death. [20] If he mostly does right and only a little wrong, he is enveloped in those very elements and experiences happiness in heaven. [21] But if he mostly indulges in wrong and only a little in right, he is abandoned by those elements and experiences the tortures given by Yama. [22] And after the living soul has suffered the tortures given by Yama and his stains are erased, he enters those same five elements again, each part distributed (into its own element). [23] Seeing with his very own intellect these levels of existence of the living soul that result from right and from wrong, a man should always set his mind-and-heart on what is right.

[24] Know that lucidity, energy, and darkness are the three qualities of the self, through which the great one pervades and endures in all these existences, without exception. [25] Whenever one of these qualities entirely prevails in a body, it makes the particular quality predominant in the embodied (soul). [26] Lucidity is traditionally regarded as knowledge, darkness as ignorance, and energy as passion and hate; this is their form, that enters and pervades all living beings. [27] Among these (three), a person should recognize as lucidity whatever he perceives in his self as full of joy, something of pure light which seems to be entirely at peace. [28] But he should recognize as energy whatever is full of unhappiness and gives his self no joy, something which is hard to oppose and constantly seduces embodied creatures. [29] And he should recognize as darkness whatever is full of confusion, undifferentiated, whatever is sensual and cannot be understood through reason or intelligence.

[30] Now I will also explain, leaving nothing out, the highest, middle, and hindmost fruits that result from these three qualities.

[31] The recitation of the Veda, inner heat, knowledge, purification, suppression of the sensory powers, the rites of duty, and meditation on the soul are the mark of the quality of goodness. [32] Delight in enterprises, instability, persistence in doing what should not be done, and continual indulgence in the sensory objects are the mark of the quality of energy. [33] Greed, sleep, incontinence, cruelty, atheism, losing jobs, habitually asking for hand-outs, and carelessness are the mark of the quality of darkness.

[*34*] The following should be regarded as the marks of the qualities in a nutshell, in order, as each of these three qualities occurs in the three (time periods).

[*35*] When someone who has done, or is doing, or is going to do an act feels ashamed, a learned man should realize that that whole act has the mark of the quality of darkness. [*36*] When someone hopes to achieve great fame in this world by a certain act, but does not feel sorry if it fails, that should be known as (an act with the quality of) energy. [*37*] But when he longs with his all to know something and is not ashamed when he does it, and his self is satisfied by it, that (act) has the mark of the quality of lucidity. [*38*] Pleasure is the mark of darkness, profit is said to be the mark of energy, and religion the mark of lucidity, and each is better than the one before it.

[*39*] Now I will tell you, in a nutshell and in order, the transmigrations in this whole (universe) that one achieves by each of these qualities: [*40*] people of lucidity become gods, people of energy become humans, and people of darkness always become animals; this is the three-fold level of existence. [*41*] But it should be realized that this three-fold level of existence, which is dependent on the qualities, is itself three-fold: lowest, middle, and highest, according to the specific act and learning (of the actor).

[*42*] Stationary objects, worms and bugs, fish, snakes, turtles, livestock, and wild animals are the hindmost level of existence to which darkness leads. [*43*] Elephants, horses, servants, despised barbarians, lions, tigers, and boars are the middle level of existence to which darkness leads. [*44*] Strolling actors, birds, deceiving men, ogres, and ghouls are the highest level of existence to which darkness leads.

[*45*] Pugilists, wrestlers, dancers, arms-dealers, and addicted gamblers and drunks are the lowest level of existence to which energy leads. [*46*] Kings, rulers, the personal priests of kings, and those obsessed with the battle of words are the middle level of existence to which energy leads. [*47*] Centaurs, gnomes, genies, servants of the gods, and celestial nymphs are the whole of the highest level of existence to which energy leads.

[*48*] Ascetics, renouncers, priests, the hosts of gods who fly about on celestial chariots, the constellations, and the anti-gods are the first level of existence to which lucidity leads. [*49*] Sacrificers, sages, gods, the Vedas, the celestial lights, the years, the ancestors, and the Amenables are the second level of existence to which lucidity leads. [*50*] Wise men say that Brahmā, the creators of the whole universe, religion, the great one, and the unmanifest are the highest level of existence to which lucidity leads.

[*51*] All that results from the three sorts of action has thus been explained, the entire system of transmigration for all living beings, which is divided into three types, each of which is further subdivided into three. [*52*] Because of their addiction to their sensory powers and their failure to uphold religion, the worst of men, who have learned nothing, undergo evil transmigrations. [*53*] Learn, now, in full and in order, what particular womb this living soul enters in this world as a result of each particular action here.

[*54*] Those who commit major crimes spend a great many years in terrible hells, and when that is over they experience the following transmigrations:

[*55*] A priest-killer gets the womb of a dog, a pig, a donkey, a camel, a cow, a goat, a sheep, a wild animal, a bird, a 'Fierce' Untouchable, or a 'Tribal'. [*56*] A priest who drinks liquor enters (the womb) of a worm, bug, or moth, of birds who eat excrement, and of violent creatures. [*57*] A priest who is a thief (is reborn) thousands of times in spiders, snakes, and lizards, aquatic animals, and violent ghouls. [*58*] A man who violates his guru's marriage-bed (is reborn) hundreds of times in grasses, shrubs, and vines, in (beasts) that are carnivorous or that have fangs, and (in people) who engage in cruel actions. [*59*] Violent men become carnivorous (beasts); people who eat impure things become worms; thieves (become animals that) devour one another; and men who have sex with women of the lowest castes become ghosts. [*60*] A man who has associated with fallen men or has had sex with the wife of another man or has stolen the property of a priest becomes a priest-ogre. [*61*] A man who out of greed has stolen jewels, pearls, or coral, or the various gems, is born among goldsmiths.

[*62*] For stealing grain, a man becomes a rat; for brass, a goose; for water, an aquatic bird; for honey, a stinging insect; for milk, a crow; for spices, a dog; for clarified butter, a mongoose; [*63*] for meat, a vulture; for marrow, a cormorant; for sesame oil, an 'oil-drinker'; for salt, a cricket; and for yogurt, a crane; [*64*] for stealing silk, a partridge; for linen, a frog; for cotton cloth, a curlew; for a cow, an iguana; for molasses, a bat; [*65*] for fine perfumes, a muskrat; for leafy vegetables, a peacock; for various kinds of cooked foods, a porcupine, and for uncooked food, a hedgehog. [*66*] For stealing fire he becomes a heron; for household articles, a housebuilder wasp; for stealing dyed clothes, he becomes a pheasant; [*67*] for a deer or an elephant, a wolf; for a horse, a tiger; for fruit and roots, a monkey; for a woman, a bear; for water, a sparrow; for vehicles, a camel; for livestock, a goat.

[*68*] Whenever a man has forcibly taken away another man's property, or has eaten an oblation when it has not been offered into the fire, he inevitably becomes an animal. [*69*] Women, too, who steal

in this way incur guilt; they become the wives of those very same creatures. [*70*] But those classes who slip from their own innate activites when they are not in extremity pass through evil transmigrations and then became the menial servants of aliens. [*71*] A priest who has slipped from his own duty becomes a 'comet-mouth' ghost who eats vomit; a ruler becomes a 'false-stinking' ghost who eats impure things and corpses. [*72*] A commoner who has slipped from his own duty becomes a ghost 'who sees by an eye in his anus', eating pus; a servant becomes a 'moth-eater' (ghost).

[*73*] The more that sensual men indulge in the sensory objects, the more their weakness for them grows. [*74*] Through the repetition of their evil actions, men of little intelligence experience miseries in womb after womb in this world: [*75*] they are rolled about in dreaded hells like the hell of 'Darkness', and are tied up and chopped up in hells like the 'Forest of Sword Leaves'; [*76*] they suffer various tortures; they are eaten by crows and owls, burnt by scorching sand, and boiled in pots, which is horrible; [*77*] they are reborn in bad wombs, which causes constant and overwhelming unhappiness, and are assailed with cold and heat and various terrors; [*78*] over and over they dwell in wombs and undergo birth, which is horrible; wretched chains are theirs, and they are the menial servants of other men; [*79*] they are separated from their relatives and dear ones and live with bad people; they make money and lose it, and they make friends and enemies; [*80*] then comes old age, that cannot be held back, and the suffering brought by diseases, and various troubles; and finally death, that cannot be conquered. [*81*] But a man reaps the appropriate fruit of any act in a body that has the qualities of the frame of mind in which he committed that act.

[*82*] All the fruits that are the consequences of actions have thus been pointed out to you; now learn the activity that brings about the supreme good for a priest.

[*83*] The recitation of the Veda, inner heat, knowledge, the repression of the sensory powers, non-violence, and serving the guru bring about the supreme good. [*84*] But of all these auspicious activities here on earth, is one activity said to be best able to bring about the supreme good for a man? [*85*] The knowledge of the self is traditionally regarded as the ultimate of all of these; it is the first of all forms of learning because through it immortality is achieved.

[*86*] But of the six activities listed above, Vedic activity must always be recognized as the best able to bring about the supreme good both here on earth and after death. [*87*] For all of these (activities), without exception, are encompassed in the performance of Vedic activity, each in a particular rule for a ritual, one by one in order. [*88*] There are two kinds of Vedic activity: the one that brings about

engagement (in worldly action) and the rise of happiness, and the one that brings about disengagement (from worldly action) and the supreme good. [*89*] The activity of engagement is said to be driven by desire in this world and the world beyond; but the activity of disengagement is said to be free of desire and motivated by knowledge. [*90*] The man who is thoroughly dedicated to the activity of engagement becomes equal to the gods; but the man who is dedicated to disengagement passes beyond the five elements.

[*91*] The man who sacrifices to the self, equally seeing the self in all living beings and all living beings in the self, becomes independent. [*92*] A priest should give up even the activities described above and devote himself diligently to the knowledge of the self, to tranquillity, and to the recitation of the Veda. [*93*] For that is what makes a birth fruitful, especially for a priest; by attaining that, and in no other way, a twice-born man has done what has to be done.

[*94*] The Veda is the eternal eye of the ancestors, gods, and humans; the teachings of the Veda are impossible to master and impossible to measure; this is an established fact. [*95*] All those revealed canons and various evil doctrines that are outside the Veda bear no fruit after death, for they are all traditionally known to be based upon darkness. [*96*] The (teachings), differing from that (Veda), that spring up and die out bear no fruit and are false, because they are of a modern date. [*97*] The four classes, the three worlds, the four stages of life, the past, the present, and the future, are all individually explained by the Veda. [*98*] Sound, touch, form, taste, and smell as the fifth are brought to birth from the Veda alone; they are born in keeping with their qualities and their innate activities. [*99*] The eternal teachings of the Veda sustain all living beings; therefore I regard it as the ultimate means of this living creature's fulfilment.

[*100*] The man who knows the teachings of the Veda is worthy of being general of the army, king, dispenser of punishment, and overlord of all the world. [*101*] Just as a fire that has gained strength burns up even wet trees, so a man who knows the Veda burns up the fault born of his own action. [*102*] A man who knows the true meaning of the teachings of the Veda becomes fit for union with ultimate reality even while he remains here in this world, no matter what stage of life he is in. [*103*] Those who read the books are better than those who do not know them; those who remember them are better than those who read them; those who understand them are better than those who remember them; and those who put them into action are better than those who understand them.

[*104*] Inner heat and knowledge are the ultimate cause of the supreme good for a priest; through inner heat he destroys his guilt, and through knowledge he achieves immortality. [*105*] A man who

wants to keep his duty clean must know thoroughly the triad (of authorities for knowledge): eye-witness perception, inference, and the teachings found in various sectarian texts. [*106*] The man who uses reason, which does not contradict the teachings of the Veda, to investigate the sages' (Veda) and the instructions about duty – he alone, and no one else, knows duty.

[*107*] The activity that brings about the supreme good has thus been declared, leaving nothing out; now the secret of the teachings of Manu will be taught.

[*108*] If (the question) should arise, 'What about the laws that have not been mentioned?' (the reply is): 'What educated priests say should be the undoubted law.' [*109*] And those who have studied the Vedas and its appendages in accordance with the law, and who use the revealed canon and eye-witness perception in their argument, should be recognized as educated priests. [*110*] Whatever law is agreed upon by an assembly of ten people or more, or even three people or more, who persist in their proper occupations, that law should not be disputed. [*111*] An assembly of ten people or more should consist of three people each of whom knows one of the three Vedas, a logician, a ritual theologian, an etymologist, a man who can recite the law, and three men from (each of) the first three stages of life. [*112*] An assembly of three people or more, to make decisions in doubtful questions of law, should consist of a man who knows the ṛg *Veda*, a man who knows the *Yajur Veda*, and a man who knows the *Sāma Veda*. [*113*] The law that is determined by even a single priest who knows the Veda should be recognized as the supreme law, but not one that is proclaimed by millions of ignorant men. [*114*] If thousands of men join together who have not kept their vow, who do not know the Vedic verses, and who merely live off their (high) caste, they do not constitute an assembly. [*115*] When fools who incarnate darkness and do not know the law teach it to someone, his evil, multiplied a hundred times, rebounds upon those who propound it.

[*116*] Everything that brings about the supreme good has thus been described to you. A priest who does not slip from this progresses to the ultimate level of existence. [*117*] Thus did the lord god tell me the whole of this supreme secret of religion, through his desire to do what is good for people.

[*118*] Concentrating his mind, a man should see everything, including what is real and unreal, in the self, for if he sees everything in the self he will not set his mind on what is wrong. [*119*] The self alone is all the deities; everything rests upon the self; for the self engenders the performance of the activities of these embodied creatures. [*120*] He should superimpose the ether on the openings of his body, the wind on his organs of motion and touch, the supreme

brilliant energy on his stomach and sight, the waters on his fat, and the earth on his solid parts; [*121*] the moon on his mind-and-heart, the cardinal directions on his ear, Visṇu on his stride, Hara (Siva) on his strength, Fire on his speech, Mitra on his excretion, and the Lord of Creatures on his organ of procreation.

[*122*] He should know that the supreme Man is the ruler of them all, smaller even than the smallest atom, bright as gold, perceptible only in sleep. [*123*] Some say that he is Fire, others that he is Manu, the Lord of Creatures, others Indra, others the vital breath, others the eternal ultimate reality. [*124*] With the five physical forms he pervades all living beings and through birth, growth, and decay constantly makes them revolve in transmigration like wheels. [*125*] Whoever thus sees the self through the self in all living beings achieves equanimity towards all of them and reaches the supreme condition, ultimate reality.

[*126*] A twice-born man who reads this, the teachings of Manu as proclaimed by Bhṛgu, will always act with the proper conduct and will reach the level of existence that he desires.

End of Chapter 12

[4] The three kinds are good, bad, and neutral; the three bases are the mind-and-heart, speech, and the body; and the ten distinctive marks, distributed among the three bases, are about to be defined in the next three verses, which give only the negative version of each mark that distinguishes good actions from bad or neutral actions.

[5] The commentators offer examples of what is undesirable (killing a priest, and other things that are forbidden) and a falsehood (saying, 'There is no world beyond' or 'The body is the soul').

[8] He experiences sorrow, verbal abuse by others, and diseases, respectively.

[10] A man with a triple rod (*tridaṇḍin*) is a wandering ascetic who carries a kind of rough trident of three staves bound together. This verse puns on the word for rod/punishment/enforcement (*daṇḍa*) and argues that the true triple 'rod' is not a material trident but a triple moral constraint. Similarly, in 9.296 the seven-member kingdom stands firmly upright like three staves (tied together).

[12] The knower of the field (*kṣetrajña*) is the individual soul that knows, and moves to action, the physical self or the body composed of the elements (*bhūtātman*).

[13] The commentators identify the living soul (*jīva*) variously with a combination of the subtle body and the great one (described at 1.15 and mentioned in 12.14), or a combination of mind, intelligence, and the sense of 'I' (1.14). Some also identify 'all who have bodies' (*dehins*) with the knowers of the field.

[14] The commentators differ greatly in their interpretations of this verse. Most of them identify 'the one who endures in living beings' as the supreme soul (*paramātman*), but one identifies him as the body, and takes the verse to mean that the individual soul (the knower of the field) pervades the body (which is connected with the elements), and the supreme soul (the great one) pervades the individual soul.

[15] The commentators suggest that 'he' is the supreme soul and that the physical forms are the individual souls, the knowers of the field.

[17] Neither the grammar nor the meaning of this verse is entirely clear. 'Here' (*iha*), which

usually means 'here on earth' in Manu, in this case must mean 'there in hell'.

[18] 'He' is the individual soul. The two who have great energy are probably the two referred to in verse 12.14, the great one and the knower of the field, though various commentators gloss them as the great one and the supreme soul or the individual soul and the supreme soul.

[19] The pair are almost certainly the dead man's religious merit (*dharma*) and evil, though some commentators identify them as the great one and the knower of the field.

[20] He is enveloped in a body made of the five elements, as in 12.16, though this time the body is made in order that he may enjoy heaven, not suffer the torments of hell. 'Right' and 'wrong' here translate *dharma* and *adharma*.

[21] To reconcile this verse with 12.16, the commentators suggest that the dead man is abandoned by the five elements of his normal human body – and, indeed, a common euphemism for death is 'to dissolve back into the five elements' – in order to take on a special, indestructible body in which to be tortured, the body described in 12.16.

[24] Lucidity or goodness (*sattva*), energy or passion (*rajas*), and darkness or torpor (*tamas*), the three qualities (*guṇas*) of matter in 1.15–20, are also the qualities of the self.

[38] The three human goals (*puruṣārthas*: *kāma, artha*, and *dharma*) are thus correlated with the three qualities.

[47] Gnomes (*guhyakas*) are the servants of Kubera, the god of wealth.

[48] Anti-gods are *daityas,* the sons of Diti, the least offensive of the many families of demons.

[49] The Amenables are the *sādhyas*.

[59] The word for 'ghost' (*preta*) is also the word for a dead spirit or a dead body.

[60] The priest-ogre (*brahmarākṣasa*) is a particular kind of demon; for they, too, have castes and classes.

[63] The word translated as 'oil-drinker' is *tailapaka*, which no lexicographer seems to know, but which may be used here through a pun on sesame oil (*taila*); the commentators say it is a winged animal or bird (*pakṣin*) that drinks oil, and Bühler says it may be a cockroach. The cormorant is a *madgu* and the cricket a *cīrīvāka*.

[64] The partridge is a *tittiri*; the frog a *dardura*; the curlew a *krauñca*; the iguana a *godhā* (perhaps punning on cow, *go*); and the bat a *vāgguda* (perhaps punning on molasses, *guḍa*).

[65] The muskrat is a *chucchundarī*. For the porcupine and hedgehog (and, indeed, for a list parallel to this in many ways), see 5.18.

[66] The house-builder wasp is a *gṛhakārin*; the pheasant a *jīvajīvaka*.

[67] The sparrow is a *stokaka*.

[71] The 'comet-mouth' is a *ulkāmukha*; the 'false-stinking' is a *kūṭapūtana*.

[72] The ghost 'who sees by an eye in his anus' is the *maitrākṣijyotika*; the 'moth-eater' is a *cailāśaka*.

[75] See 4.84–91 for hells.

[81] That is, if he commits an act when his disposition is predominantly characterized by lucidity, he will be reborn in the body of god.

[83] For other lists of the standard virtues, see 6.91–4 and 10.63.

[86] Vedic activity, which is described in the following verses, may refer either to Vedic ritual or to the more general activities prescribed in the Veda.

[92] A similar passage in favour of renunciation, even in preference to the Vedic ritual that is otherwise Manu's first concern, appears at 6.86 and 6.96.

[94] The meaning of *aśākya* (here translated as 'impossible to master') is that humans cannot have composed the Veda, which is beyond the range of human powers, and cannot comprehend it.

[98] That is, the Veda produces the five sensory powers within matter, each with its own set

of qualities (*guṇas*) and innate activities (*karmans*), as is described in 1.20–21.

[99] ‘This living creature’ is presumably the man entitled to carry out Vedic activity.

[109] This verse refers to the three authorities for knowledge mentioned in 12.105: eye-witness perception, revealed canon (religious texts), and argument (inference). The final compound may be variously interpreted, and is, by the commentaries; it may also mean ‘those who use eye-witness perception, the revealed canon, and agrument’ (i.e. all three authorities), or ‘those who make their arguments using the revealed canon as their eye-witness’.

[120] He should meditate upon the superimposition, or identity, of these two orders of being, or upon the connections (*bandhus*) between them, first established in ṛg *Veda* 10.90.13–14.

[124] His five physical forms are the five great elements.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The basic bibliography is Ludwik Sternbach's *Bibliography of Dharma and Artha in Ancient and Medieval India* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1973), updated in subsequent issues of *Revue historique du droit français et étranger*.

1. SANSKRIT EDITIONS OF *The Laws of Manu*

DAVE, JAYANTAKRISHNA HARIKRISHNA, *Manusmṛti*, with the commentaries of Medhātithi, Sarvajñanārāyaṇa, Kullūka, Rāghavānanda, Nandana, Rāmacandra, Maṇirāma, Govindarāja and Bhāruci, 5 vols. (Bombay: Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, Bharatiya Vidya Series, vol. 29ff., 1972-).

JOLLY, J., *Mānavadharmaśāstra*, with extracts from four commentaries (London: Trübner, 1887). *Manu-ṭikā-sangraha*, collection of commentaries (Calcutta: *Bibliotheca Indica* 556, 584, 724).

KURUNDAKARA, N., *Manusmṛti* (Mumbai: Lokavamaya Grhya, 1983).

MANDLIK, VISHVANATH NARAYAN, *Mānava-Dharma Śāstra (Institutes of Manu), with the commentaries of Medhātithi, Sarvajñanārāyaṇa, Kullūka, Rāghavānanda, Nandana, and Rāmachandra, and an Appendix by the Honourable Ras Saheb,* 2 vols. (Bombay: Ganpat Krishnaraji's Press, 1886). Vol. 3 appends the commentary of Govindarāja, edited by Rao Saheb.

MOTWANI, K., *Manu Dharma Śāstra* (Madras 1959).

STERNBACH L., *Mānavadharmaśāstra* (Varanasi: All India Kashiraj Trust, 1974).

2. TRANSLATIONS OF *The Laws of Manu*

BÜHLER, G., *The Laws of Manu,* SBE vol. 25 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1886; reprinted, New York: Dover Press, 1969).

BURNELL, A., and HOPKINS, E. W., *Manavadharmaśāstra* (London: K. Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co. Ltd, 1891; reprinted, New Delhi: Oriental Books Reprint Corp., 1971).

DERRETT, J. D. M., *Manuśāstravivaraṇa*, trans. of text and Bhāruci's commentary on Books 6–12, 2 vols. (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1975).

ELMANOVICH, S. D., (Russian) (St Petersburg, 1913).

IL'IN, F. F., (Russian) (Moscow, 1960).

JHA, G., *Manu Smṛti with Bhāṣyā of Medhātithi*, 5 vols. (Calcutta: University of Calcutta Press, 1920).

JOLLY, JULIUS, German trans. of Chapter 8 and part of Chapter 9 in

Zeitschrift für vergleichende Rechtswissenschaft, vols. 3 and 4, 1882.

JONES, SIR WILLIAM, *Institutes of Hindu Law, or the Ordinances of Menu [sic] according to the Gloss of Culluca, comprising the Indian System of Duties, Religious and Civil* (Calcutta, 1794).

LOISELEUR-DESLONGCHAMPS, A., *Lois de Manou* (Paris: L'Imprimerie de Crapelet, 1833).

MACFIE, JOHN MANDEVILLE, *The Laws of Manu: A Summary in English* (Madras: The Christian Literature Society for India, 1921) (131 pp.).

STREHLY, G., *Les Lois de Manou* (Paris, 1893).

3. SELECTED SECONDARY STUDIES OF *The Laws of Manu*

ACHYUTHAN, M., *Educational Practices in Manu, Panini, and Kautilya* (Trivandrum: College Book House, 1975).

AGARWALA, V. S., *India as Described by Manu* (Varanasi, 1970). *The Science of Social Organization or the Laws of Manu in the Light of Theosophy* (Adyar, 1919).

ALTEKAR, A. S., *Sources of Hindu Dharma in its Socio-Religious Aspects* (Sholapur, 1952).

AYER, U. A. K., *Hindu Śāstras and Saṃskāras* (Bombay: Bharatiya, 1971).

AYYAR, R. S. VAIDYANATHA, *Manu's Land and Trade Laws* (Delhi: Oriental Publishers and Distributors, 1976).

BAGCHI, S. C., *Juristic Personality of Hindu Deities* (Calcutta, 1933).

BANERJEE, N. N., *Manu and Modern Times* (New Delhi: Hindutva Publications, 1975).

BANERJEE, N. V., *Studies in the Dharmaśāstra of Manu* (New Delhi: Mushiram Manoharlal, 1980).

BANARJI, GOOROODAS, *Hindu Law of Marriage and Strīdhana*, 2nd ed. (Tagore Law Lectures, 1st ed. 1878; 5th ed., by S. C. Banerji, Calcutta: S. K. Lahiri, 1923).

BANERJI, S. C., *Dharma Sūtras: A Study in their Origins and Development* (Calcutta, 1962). *Smṛti Material in the Mahābhārata* (Calcutta, 1972).

BEAMAN, G. B., *On the Sources of the Dharmaśāstras of Manu and Yajñavalkya* (Leipzig, 1895).

BETAI, R. S., *A Reconstruction of the Original Interpretation of the Manusmṛti* (Ahmedabad, 1970).

'Criminal law from Manu to Yajñavalkya to Nārada: A positive transition', *Journal of the Oriental Institute* 22:3 (1973), pp. 265–89.

'State of Criminal Law in Manusmṛti', *Journal of the Ganganatha Jha Research Institute* 24 (1968), pp. 279–98.

‘Revisions of the Manusmṛti and the Background of These: A Fresh Study’, *Journal of the Ganganatha Jha Research Institute* 22:3–4 (1966), pp. 193–201.

‘The textual problem of Manusmṛti’, *Journal of the Gujarat Research Society* 24, pp. 271–6.

BHATTACHARYA, B., *Studies in Dharmaśāstra* (Calcutta, 1964).

BÖHTLINGK, O., ‘Bemerkungen zu Manu’s Gesetzbuch’, in *Königlichen Sachsiche Geschichte der Wissenschaften* (7 November 1896), pp. 245–50.

BOSE, H. A., ‘Manu’s Mixed Castes’, *Indian Antiquary* (1923), pp. 24–9.

BROWN, C. MACKENZIE, ‘Some Modern Views of the Manusaṃhitā’, *Adyar Library Bulletin* 31:2 (1967–8), pp. 95ff.

CHOBE, B. N., *Principles of Dharmashastra* (Allahabad, n.d.).

DAS, R. M., *Women in Manu and His Seven Commentators* (Varanasi, 1962).

DERRETT, J. D. M., ‘Dharmaśāstra and Juridical Literature’, in Jan Gonda (ed.), *History of Indian Literature*, vol. 4, pt 1 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1973).

Essays in Classical and Modern Hindu Law (Leiden: Brill, 1976).

Hindu Law, Past and Present (Calcutta, 1957).

‘History of Indian Law (Dharmaśāstra)’, in B. Spuler (ed.), *Handbuch der Orientalistik,* vol. 2, ed. J. Gonda (Leiden, 1973).

Religion, Law and the State in India (London: Faber and Faber, 1968).

DONIGER, WENDY. *See* O’Flaherty, Wendy Doniger.

DUTT, M. N., *The Dharma Śāstras or the Hindu Law Codes* (Calcutta, 1908).

FRAUWALLNER, E., ‘Untersuchungen zum Moksadharma’, *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 45 (1925), pp. 51–67.

GALANTER, MARC, *Competing Equalities: Law and the Backward Classes in India* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984).

GHARPURE, J. R., *Manusmṛti with the Bhāshyā of Medhātiti* (Bombay: Collection ot Hindu Law Texts, 1917).

Teachings of Dharmaśāstra (Lucknow, 1956).

GHOSE, J. C., *Principles of Hindu Law* (Calcutta, 1917–19).

GHOSHAL, U. N., ‘The Status of Śūdras in the Dharmasūtras’, *Indian Culture* 14:1 (1947), pp. 21–7.

‘The Status of Brāhmaṇas in the Dharmasūtras’, *Indian Historical Quarterly* 23:2 (1947), pp. 83–92.

GLUCKLICH, ARIEL, *Religious Jurisprudence in the Dharmaśāstra* (New York: Macmillan, 1988).

'Dharma and Social Justice in the Criminal Code of Manu', *Contributions to Indian Sociology* (n.s.) 16:1 (1982), pp. 57–78.

'Images and Symbols in the Phenomenology of Dharma', *History of Religions* 29:3 (February, 1990), pp. 259–87.

GOPAL, RAM, *India of the Vedic Kalpasūtras* (Delhi: National Publishing House, 1959).

'Manu's Indebtedness to Śānkhyāyana', *Poona Orientalist* 27 (1962), pp. 39–44.

GOSWAMI, KRISHNAGOPAL, 'The Mānava Principle in Manu and Nietzche's [*sic*] Appraisal', in *Dr Satkari Mookerji Felicitation Volume* (Varanasi: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office, 1969), pp. 685–95.

GUPTA, A. S., 'Manu on the Duties of Kings', *Journal of Indian History* 48:2 (1970), pp. 399–404.

GUPTA, R. K., *Political Thought in the Smṛti Literature* (Allahabad, 1961).

HAZRA, R. C., 'Dharma: Its Early Meaning and Scope', *Our Heritage* 7:1 (1959), pp. 15–35; 8:1 (1960), pp. 7–34.

'The Sources of Dharma', *Our Heritage* 2:2 (1954), pp. 249–63; 3:1 (1955), pp. 65–88; 3:2 (1955), pp. 221–38; 52 (1957), pp. 87–102.

HOPKINS, E. W., 'On the Professed Quotations from Manu found in the Mahābhārata', *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 11 (1885), pp. 239–75.

The Mutual Relations of the Four Castes according to the Mānavadharmaśāstra (Leipzig: Breitkopf & Hartell, 1881).

JAYASWAL, K.P., *Manu and Yajñavalkya, a Comparison and a Contrast: A Treatise on the Basic Hindu Law* (Calcutta: Butterworth, 1930).

JHA, A., *Essentials of Mānava-dharmaśāstra* (Hyderabad, 1950).

JHA, G., *Hindu Law in its Sources* (Allahabad, 1930–31).

JHA, V. N., 'Varṇasaṃkara in the Dharmasūtras: Theory and Practice', *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* (Leiden) 13:3 (1970), pp. 273–88.

JOHAENTGEN, F., *Über das Gesetzbuch des Manu* (Berlin, 1863).

JOLLY, J., *Recht und Sitte* (Strasbourg, 1896); trans. as *Hindu Law and Custom* (Calcutta, 1928).

'Arthaśāstra and Dharmaśāstra', *ZDMG* 67 (1913), pp. 49–96.

JOSHI, LAXMANSHASTRI (ed.), *Dharmakośa* 5 vols. (Wai, Dist. Satara: Prajnapathasala Mandala, 1938).

KANE, P. V., *History of Dharmaśāstra*, 5 vols. (Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, 1930–62).

'The predecessors of Vijñāneśvara', *Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society* (n. 5), I (1924), pp. 193–215.

KANGLE, R. P., 'Manu and Kautilya', *Indian Antiquary* (n.s.) 1:1 (1964).

KETKAR, SHRIDAR V., *The History of Caste in India: Evidence of the Laws of Manu*, 2 vols. (Ithaca, 1909).

KUPPUSWAMY, BANGALORE, *Dharma and Society* (Delhi: Macmillan, 1977).

LAINE, JAMES W., 'The Creation Account in Manusmṛti', *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute* 62 (1981), pp. 157–68.

LASZLO, FRANZ, *Die Parallelversion der Manusmṛti im Bhaviṣya-purāṇa* (Wiesbaden, 1971).

LINGAT, R., *Les sources du droit dans le système traditionnel de l'Inde* (Paris, 1967); trans., by J. D. M. Derrett, as *The Classical Law of India* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1973).

'Buddhist Manu on the Propagation of Hindu Law in Hinayanist Indo-China', *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute* 30 (1949–50), pp. 284–97.

'Time and the Dharma: On *Manu*, I 85–86', *Contributions to Indian Sociology* 6 (1962), pp. 7–16.

LOSCH, H., *Rājadharma* (Bonn, 1959).

MANICKAM, T. M. *Dharma according to Manu and Moses* (Bangalore: Dharmaram Publications, 1977).

MEES, G. H., *Dharma and Society* (The Hague, 1935).

MERCEREAU, H., *Le Droit positif chez les Hindous d'après le Mānava-dharma-śāstra* (Paris, 1925).

MEYER, J. J., *Über das Wesen der Altindischen Rechtsschriften und ihr Verhältnis zu einander und zu Kauṭilya* (Leipzig, 1927).

MOTWANI, K. *Manu: A Study in Hindu Social Theory* (Madras, 1934).

MUIR, JOHN, 'Notes on the lax observance of caste rules, and other features of social and religious life, in ancient India', *Indian Antiquary* 6 (1877), pp. 251–64.

MUKHERJI, P., 'Property rights of women as recorded in Kauṭilīya Arthaśāstra and Manusmṛti, *Our Heritage* 9:1 (1961), pp. 49-60.

'Widowhood and *niyoga* in the Arthaśāstra and Manusmṛti', *Our Heritage* 11 (1963), pp. 1–15.

MULLA, D. F., *Principles of Hindu Law*, 13th ed., S. T. Desai (ed.) (Bombay, 1966; reprinted 1970).

NOLD, M. T., *Guilt and Expiation in the Hindu Law Codes* (Columbia University Ph.D. dissertation, 1978).

O'FLAHERTY, WENDY DONIGER, and DERRETT, J. D. M., *The Concept of Duty in South Asia* (London: School of Oriental and African Studies; Delhi: Vikas; 1978).

ORENSTEIN, HENRY, 'Logical consequence in Hindu social law: another interpretation', *Contributions to Indian Sociology* (n. 5) 4 (1970), pp. 22–34.

PARADKAR, M. D., *Similes in Manusmṛti* (Delhi, 1960).

PATWARDHAN, M. V., *Manu-smṛti. The Ideal Democratic Republic of Manu* (Delhi, 1968).

Manuvāda, or the Hindu Socialistic Democracy (Belgaum: H. M. Patwardan, 1973).

PRABHU, P. N., *Hindu Social Organization: A Study in Social, Psychological, and Ideological Foundations,* 2nd ed. (Bombay, 1954).

RAGHAVAN, V., 'The Manu Smṛti', in *The Cultural Heritage of India,* 2nd ed. (Calcutta, 1959), pp. 335–63.

'Rājavidyā: Manu and the Bhagavadgītā', in *T. M. P. Mahadevan Commemorative Volume* (Madras, 1963).

RAMAMOORTHY, R., 'Concept of Punishment under Manu Smṛti', *Indian Philosophical Quarterly* 2:1 (1974), pp. 51–64.

RAMAN, N. S. SUNDARA, *Ethical Implications of Manu's Code: A Study of the Nature, Definition, and Implications of the Concept of Dharma with Reference to Manusmṛti,* Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Rajasthan, 1955.

RANGASWAMI AIYANGAR, K. V., *Some Aspects of the Social and Political System of Manu* (Lucknow: Lucknow University, 1949).

Some Aspects of the Hindu View of Life According to Dharmaśātra (Baroda, 1952).

ROCHER, L., 'Ancient Indian Criminal Law', *Journal of Oriental Research* 25 (1955), pp. 15–34.

'Schools of Hindu Law', in *India Maior* (Gonda Felicitation Volume) (Leiden, 1972), pp. 167–76.

'Droit Hindou ancien', in J. Gilissen (ed.), *Introduction bibliographique à l'histoire du droit et à l'ethnologie juridique* (Brussels, 1965).

'Caste and Occupation in Classical India: The Normative Texts', *Contributions to Indian Sociology* (n.s.) 9:1 (1975), pp. 139–51.

'La Sacralité du pouvoir dans l'Inde ancienne d'après les textes de dharma', *Annales du Centre d'Études des Religions* (Brussels, 1962), pp. 123–37.

SANE, P. S., 'Use of Mīmāṃsā in Dharma Śāstra', in *Centenary High Court of Judicature of Allahabad (1866–1966),* Commemoration Volume 1 (Allahabad: High Court Centenary Committee, 1966), pp. 112–32.

SASTRI, A. CHINNASWAMI, 'On the Date and Authorship of Manu', *Our Heritage* 1:2 (1953), pp. 307–16.

SASTRI, H. C., *The Law of Debt in Ancient Indian Law* (Calcutta, 1971).

SASTRY, K. R. R., *Manu and Thiruvalluvar: A Comparative Study* (Madras: Sangam Publishers, 1973).

The Dharmasūtras and the Dharmaśāstras (Tirupati, 1952).

Hindu Jurisprudence (Calcutta, 1964).

SELVANYAKI, M. T., ‘Manu in Ancient Hindu Polity’, *Education Review* 76:6 (1970), pp. 126–8.

SEN, P. N., *General Principles of Hindu Jurisprudence* (Calcutta, 1918).

SEN-GUPTA, N. C., *Sources of Law and Society in Ancient India* (Calcutta, 1914).

Evolution of Ancient Indian Law (Calcutta and London, 1953).

SETLUR, S. S., *Hindu Law Books on Inheritance* (Madras, 1911).

SHAH, H.A., ‘The Manu-smṛti in the Light of Some Recently Published Texts’, *Indian Antiquary* (1916), 112–15 and 125–9.

‘Some Remarks Supplementing “The Manu-smṛti in the Light of Some Recently Published Texts” ’, *Indian Antiquary* (1917), p. 95.

SHAH, K. J., ‘Concept of Dharma’, *Journal of Indian Academy of Philosophy* 12: 1 (1973), pp. 35–45.

SHANKARA RAMA SASTRI, C., *Fictions in the Development of Hindu Law Texts* (Adyar, 1926).

SHARMA, ARVIND, *The Puruṣārthas: A Study of Hindu Axiology* (Asian Studies Center, Michigan State University, 1982).

SHARMA, R. N., *Ancient India according to Manu* (Delhi: Nag Publishers, 1980).

SHARMA, S. D., ‘The Concept of Justice in Manu’, *Indian Sociological Journal* (1976), pp. 47–68.

SHIVASHANKARA, RAO, ‘Was Manu Unfair to Women?’, *Indian Express* (Delhi, City Edition, 12 October 1959), VI: 1.

SHREEDHARA, B. H., ‘Manu’s Theory of Kingship’, *The Journal of the Karnatak University* 15 (1971), pp. 43–50.

SPELLMAN, J. W., *Political Theory of Ancient India* (Oxford, 1964).

STERNBACH, LUDWIK, *Juridical Studies in Ancient Indian Law* (Delhi, 1965–7).

The Mānava Dharmaśāstra, I–III, and the Bhaviṣya Purāṇa (Varanasi: All India Kashi Raj Trust, 1974).

Bibliography of Dharma and Artha in Ancient and Medieval India (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1973), updated in subsequent issues of *Revue historique du droit français et étranger*.

STOKES, W., *Hindu Law Books* (Madras, 1865).

SUDA, JYOTI PRASAD, *Manu, Marx and Gandhi* (Meerut: Jai Prakash Nath, 1967).

TADPATRIKAR, S. N., ‘Cosmic Account in Manu-smṛti’, *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute* 31 (1950/51), pp. 297ff.

TIWARI, C., *Śūdras in Manu* (Delhi, 1963).

VERMA, PRATIVA, 'Family as a Social Institution according to the Mahābhārata and the Manu Smṛti', *Vedanta Kesar* 64:4 (1977), pp. 123–7.

WINTERNITZ, MORIZ, *A History of Indian Literature*, vol. II, pt. II, *Scientific Literature*, trans. Subhadra Jha (Delhi, 1967).

4. OTHER SANSKRIT TEXTS AND TRANSLATIONS CITED

Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, 2 vols., Ānandasrama Sanskrit Series, 32 (Poona: Anandasrama, 1931).

Āpastamba Dharma Sūtra, ed. U. C. Pandeya, Kashi Sanskrit Series, 93 (Varanasi: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office, 1969).

Āpastamba Śrauta Sūtra, 3 vols., ed. R. Garbe (Calcutta: Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal, 1882–1902).

Āśvalāyana Śrauta Sūtra, ed. R. Vidyaratna (Calcutta: Bibliotheca Indica, 1974).

Atharva Veda Saṃhitā, 4 vols., ed. V. Bandhu (Hoshiapur: Vishveshvaranand Vedic Research Institute, 1960–62).

Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad, Kaṭha Upaniṣad, and *Taittirīya Upaniṣad*, in *Eighteen Principal Upaniṣads*, ed. V. P. Limaye and R. D. Vadekar (Poona: Vaidika Samsodhana Mandala, 1958).

Bṛhaddevatā of Śaunaka, Harvard Oriental Series (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1904).

Kauṣītaki Brāhmaṇa, ed. H. Bhattacharya, Calcutta Sanskrit College Research Series, 73 (Calcutta: Sanskrit College, 1970).

Mahābhārata (Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, 1933–60).

Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa, Bibliotheca Indica, 29 (Calcutta, 1862).

Pañcaviṃśa Brāhmaṇa, 2 vols., ed. P. A. Cinnaswami Sastri and P. Pattabhirama Sastri, Kashi Sanskrit Series, 105 (Benares: Sanskrit Series Office, 1935).

Rāmāyaṇa (Baroda: Oriental Institute, 1960–75).

ṛg Veda Saṃhitā, with the commentary of Sāyaṇa, 4 vols., ed. F. Max Müller (London, 1890; Varanasi: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office, 1966).

Śānkhyāyana Gṛhya Sūtra, ed. and trans. S. R. Sehgal (Delhi: Munshi Ram Manoharlal, 1960).

Śānkhyāyana Śrauta Sūtra, 2 vols., ed. A. Hillebrandt (reprinted, New Delhi: Meharchand Lachhmandas, 1981).

Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, 5 vols. (Bombay: Laxmi Venkateshwar Steam Press, 1940).

Taittirīya Āraṇyaka, 2 vols., Ānandāśrama Sanskrit Series, 36 (Poona:

Anandasrama, 1981).

Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa, 3 vols., Ānandāśrama Sanskrit Series, 37 (Poona: Anandasrama, 1979).

Taittirīya Saṃhitā, 8 vols., Ānandāśrama Sanskrit Series, 42 (Poona: Anandasrama, 1978).

Taittirīya Upaniṣad, see *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad.*

Vājasaneyī Saṃhitā of the White Yajur Veda, ed. Pandit Jagdishlal Shastri (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidas, 1971).

5. OTHER SECONDARY SOURCES

ALSDORF, LUDWIG, *Beiträge zur Geschichte von Vegetarismus und Rinderverehrung in Indien*. Abhandlungen der Geistes und Sozialwissenschaftlichen Klasse, Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, no. 6 (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 1962).

BENJAMIN, WALTER, 'The Task of the Translator', in *Illuminations: Essays and Reflections,* trans. Harry Zohn, edited and with an introduction by Hannah Arendt (New York, 1969).

BIARDEAU, MADELEINE, and MALAMOUD, CHARLES, *Le Sacrifice dans l'Inde ancienne* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1976).

COMMARASWAMY, ANANDA K., *Spiritual Authority and Temporal Power in the Indian Theory of Government* (New Haven: American Oriental Society, 1942).

DUMONT, LOUIS, *Homo Hierarchicus: The Caste System and its Implications,* trans. Mark Saisbury, Louis Dumont, and Basia Gulati (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980).

ELIADE, MIRCEA, *Yoga: Immortality and Freedom* (Princeton: Bollingen, 1958).

GOODY, JACK, 'What's in a list?', pp. 74–111 of *The Domestication of the Savage Mind* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977).

HEESTERMAN, JAN, *The Inner Conflict of Tradition: Essays in Indian Ritual, Kingship, and Society* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1985).

Review of Alsdorf in *Indo-Iranian Journal* 9 (1966), pp. 147–9.

KAKAR, SUDHIR, *Intimate Relations: Exploring Indian Sexuality* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990).

KANE, P. V., *History of Dharmaśāstra,* 2nd ed., vol. 2 (Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, 1972).

LÉVI, SYLVAIN, *La Doctrine du sacrifice dans les Brāhmaṇas* (Paris: Ernest Leroux, 1898).

LÉVI-STRAUSS, CLAUDE, *Structural Anthropology* (New York: Basic Books, 1963).

LINCOLN, BRUCE, *Myth, Cosmos, and Society: Indo-European Themes of*

Creation and Destruction (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1986).

NIETZSCHE, FRIEDRICH, 'Zur Kritik des Manu-Gesetzbuches' and 'Ausgezogene Stellen aus Manu', pp. 107–30 of *Cultur und Kunst*, in *Nachgelassene Werke* (1882–8), vol. 14 of *Nietzsches Werke* (Leipzig: C. G. Naumann, 1904).

Twilight of the Idols and The Anti-Christ, trans. R.J. Hollingdale (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1968).

On the Genealogy of Morals, ed. and trans. Walter Kaufmann (New York: Vintage Books, 1959).

O'FLAHERTY, WENDY DONIGER, *Dreams, Illusion, and Other Realities* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984).

The Origins of Evil in Hindu Mythology (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1976).

Other Peoples' Myths: The Cave of Echoes (New York: Macmillan, 1988).

Tales of Sex and Violence: Folklore, Sacrifice, and Danger in the Jaiminiya Brāhmaṇna (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1985).

Women, Androgynes, and Other Mythical Beasts (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980).

RAMANUJAN, A. K., 'Is there an Indian way of thinking? An informal essay', in *Contributions to Indian Sociology* (n.s.) 23:1 (1989), pp. 41–58.

RYLE, GILBERT, *Dilemmas* (Cambridge, 1954).

SAID, EDWARD, *Orientalism* (New York: Pantheon, 1978).

SCHMIDT, HANNS-PETER, 'The Origin of Ahiṃsā', in *Mélanges d'Indianisme à la mémoire de Louis Renou* (Paris: Editions de Boccard, 1968), pp. 625–55.

SHULMAN, DAVID, *The King and the Clown in South Asian Myth and Poetry* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1985).

SMITH, BRIAN K., *Reflections on Resemblance, Ritual, and Religion* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1989).

'Eaters, Food, and Social Hierarchy in Ancient India: A Dietary Guide to a Revolution of Values', *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 50:2 (Summer 1990), pp. 201–29.

and WENDY DONIGER, 'Sacrifice and Substitution: Ritual Mystification and Mythical Demystification', *Numen* 36:2 (December 1989), pp. 189–224.

STAAL, FRITS, 'The Agnicāyana Project', in Staal (ed.), *Agni: The Vedic Ritual of the Fire Altar*, vol. 2 (Berkeley: Asian Humanities Press, 1983).

STEINER, GEORGE, *After Babel: Aspects of Language and Translation*

(London, 1975).
ZIMMERMANN, FRANCIS, *The Jungle and the Aroma of Meats* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1987).

INDEX AND GLOSSARY

Terms frequently encountered in English translation are glossed and indexed under the English term and cross-referenced under the Sanskrit term. Basic and complex Sanskrit terms with several different English renderings, such as *adharma, dharma*, and *karman*, are glossed and indexed under the Sanskrit term and cross-referenced under the various English approximations. Technical Sanskrit terms that occur rarely are glossed under the Sanskrit term. The first occurrence of each term is listed and, for significant terms, most other occurrences.

1. *Āpastamba Dharma Sūtra* 1.7.20.6. *na dharmādharmau carata āvam sva iti. na devagandharvā na pitara ity ācakṣate 'yam dharmo 'yam adharma iti.*

2. Friedrich Nietzsche, *The Antichrist* (1895), section 57, in *Twilight of the Idols and The Anti-Christ*, trans. R.J. Hollingdale (Harmondsworth, 1968), p. 177. *Dazu muss es unbewusst gemacht werden: dies der Zweck jeder heiligen Lüge.*

3. Sections 3, 4, and 5 of Part I were written by Brian K. Smith; section 2 was written by Wendy Doniger; section 1 was written jointly.

4. Wendy Doniger wrote Parts II and III.

5. See below for a discussion of the title.

6. A ‘model of’ and a ‘model for’, as Clifford Geertz would say.

7. Moriz Winternitz, *A History of Indian Literature*, vol. 2, pt 2, *Scientific Literature*, trans. Subhadra Jha (Delhi, 1967), p. 546.

8. A. Loiseleur-Deslongchamps, *Lois de Manou* (Paris, 1833); G. Strehly, *Les Lois de Manou* (Paris, 1893).

9. Julius Jolly's translation of Chapters 8 and 9 in *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Rechtswissenschaft*, vols. 3 and 4, 1882.

10. G. Pauthier (Goa, 1859).

11. S. D. Elmanovich (St Petersburg, 1913).

12. G. Bühler, *The Laws of Manu* (Oxford, 1886).

13. J. D. M. Derrett, *Manuśāstravivaraṇa*, 2 vols. (Wiesbaden, 1975), introduction.

14. ibid.

15. See 'Zur Kritik des Manu-Gesetzbuches' and 'Ausgezogene Stellen aus Manu', pp. 107–30 of *Cultur und Kunst*, in *Nachgelassene Werke* (1882–8), vol. 14 of *Nietzsche's Werke* (Leipzig, 1904). See also section 194 of *The Will of Power*. Presumably, Nietzsche knew Hüttner's 1797 German translation.

16. Friedrich Nietzsche, *The Twilight of the Idols* (1889), ‘The “Improvers” of Mankind’, section 3, trans. R. J. Hollingdale, op. cit., p. 57.

17. ibid., section 4, p. 58.

18. Friedrich Nietzsche, *The Antichrist*, section 56, trans. R.J. Hollingdale, op. cit., p. 176.

19. ibid., p. 175.

20. ibid., p. 176.

21. The best analysis of this 'agonistic' mentality may be found in the work of Jan Heesterman, to whom I am greatly indebted for the interpretation presented here. See especially the essays collected in *The Inner Conflict of Tradition: Essays in Indian Ritual, Kingship, and Society* (Chicago, 1985). Heesterman, however, usually places unbridled agonism in a hypothetical 'preclassical' age. With the dawn of the 'classical' period and the redaction of the Veda as we know it, agonism was supposedly more or less systematically eliminated. The argument set forth here assumes that much of what Heesterman might regard as anachronistic survivals of the 'preclassical' period is central to the world-view of 'classical' Vedism as it is represented in the Veda.

22. Sylvain Lévi, *La Doctrine du sacrifice dans les Brāhmaṇas* (Paris, 1898), p.9.

23. For a fuller analysis of this theme and its implications in Vedic texts, see Brian K. Smith, 'Eaters, Food and Social Hierarchy in Ancient India: A Dietary Guide to a Revolution of Values', *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 50:2 (Summer 1990), pp. 201–29.

24. *Satapatha Brāhmaṇa* 11.1.6.19.

25. For a discussion of this point, see Brian K. Smith and Wendy Doniger, 'Sacrifice and Substitution: Ritual Mystification and Mythical Demystification' *Numen* 36:2 (December 1989), pp. 189–224.

26. Note that carnivorous animals (= 'wild' animals in Vedic classification schemes) cannot be accounted for within this version of the food chain. Bruce Lincoln observes that 'Once wild animals are excluded from consideration, the groupings of fluids, plants, animals, and humans into relations of eater and eaten assume a clear and elegant form … When one introduces wild animals – that is, carnivores – into this system, the system collapses, for such animals not only eat meat (the prerogative of humans) while scorning plants (the proper food of animals), they even go so far as to eat humans. Wild beasts thus not only are a physical threat, but also pose a threat to the structures of thought appropriate to cultured existence.' *Myth, Cosmos, and Society: Indo-European Themes of Creation and Destruction* (Cambridge, Mass., 1986), p. 200.

27. ‘For water is indeed food. Therefore when water comes to this world, food is produced here.’ *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* 2.1.1.3; cf.8.61.20; *Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa* 3.2.8.1–3; *Pañcaviṃśa Brāhmaṇa* 11.8.11–12; and *Kauśītaki Brāhmaṇa* 3.4. Alternatively, the gods in the beginning made it rain and ‘as many drops fell down, that many plants were born’ as food for animals (*Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa* 2.1.1.1). For the cycle, see e.g. Manu 3.76.

28. Francis Zimmermann, *The Jungle and the Aroma of Meats* (Berkeley, 1987), p. 1.

29. *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* 6.6.3.11.
30. *Kaṭha Upaniṣad* 2.9.
31. *Taittirīya Saṃhitā* 2.5.10.1.

32. *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa* 7.29.

33. *Taittirīya Saṃhitā* 2.4.13.1.

34. For example, consider the intriguing text at *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa* 2.33, where instructions are given to the priests for secretly depriving the unwitting ruler-sacrificer of his power and rule by means of manipulation of certain recitations. A similar passage at *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa 3.19* additionally provides the method for inciting a rebellion among the commoners against their ruler should the priests wish to do so.

35. For such a standard conceptualization in Indological studies, see, for example, Ananda K. Coomaraswamy, *Spiritual Authority and Temporal Power in the Indian Theory of Government* (New Haven, 1942).

36. The *Arthaśāstra* is the paragon of such works. The Vedic viewpoint is also preserved in the medical texts of Ayurvedic traditions. But as Zimmermann notes in his *The Jungle and the Aroma of Meats*, p. 187, Ayurvedic treatises, like some of the early *dharma* texts, usually 'provide two series of texts: one series praises the virtue of meat; the other prescribes abstinence and, above all, "non-violence" (*ahiṃsā*), which is fundamentally linked with vegetarianism'. Zimmermann quotes the *Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa* (32.4) to help explain the apparent contradiction: 'Whoever eats meat commits no sin either when it has been consecrated or when it serves as remedy.'

37. *Mahābhārata* (Southern Recension) 12.15. 10ff., translated by David Shulman, *The King and the Clown in South Asian Myth and Poetry* (Princeton, 1985), p. 29.

38. For an attempt at a history of the concepts in Indian religions, see Ludwig Alsdorf, *Beiträge zur Geschichte von Vegetarismus und Rinderverehrung in Indien* (Weisbaden, 1962). The author also argues that vegetarianism and *ahiṃsā* were originally separate ideals, and that contradictions in texts like Manu regarding the pros and cons of a carnivorous diet can be explained as the conflation of historically discrete stages of thought. For an outline of a rather different explanation of these contradictions, see Jan Heesterman's review of Alsdorf in *Indo-Iranian Journal* 9 (1966), pp. 147–9. P. V. Kane, *History of Dharmaśāstra*, 2nd ed., vol. 2 (Poona, 1972), among many others, contends that 'Another motive for the insistence on *ahiṃsā* was probably the idea of defilement caused by eating flesh' (p. 776).

39. Hanns-Peter Schmidt's assumption of a Vedic 'ritual *ahiṃsā*' that is later generalized (and to some extent moralized) by the world-rencuncers depends on the notion that 'the ritualists were … deeply concerned with the killing and injuring of animate beings which occurs in the sacrifice itself'. While it is true that in Vedic ritualism there was expression of concern that the sacrificial victim should not suffer or cry out (the animal is strangled to ensure this), that he accept his fate voluntarily and eagerly and so forth, all this is part and parcel of sacrificial ideologies everywhere (see Smith and Doniger). As a virtually universal feature of sacrifice, this feature of the Vedic ritual provides no persuasive evidence for the origins of the peculiarly Indian conception of *ahiṃsā* and vegetarianism. Furthermore, Schmidt himself notes that 'in a number of instances *ahiṃsayai* refers to the prevention of injury to the sacrificer, his progeny and cattle'. 'The Origin of Ahiṃsā', in *Mélanges d'Indianisme à la mémoire de Louis Renou* (Paris, 1968), pp. 625–55. Such a self-interested *ahiṃsā* in relation to oneself and one's possessions is of course a desideratum in Vedism, but that is certainly not the *ahiṃsā* of post-Vedism.

40. Zimmermann, *The Jungle and the Aroma of Meats*, op. cit., pp. 1–2.

41. This is a line of speculation that could obviously stand further development. Since, however, Manu (unlike a text like the *Bhagavad Gītā*) appears relatively unaffected by the *bhakti* movement, such a discussion is perhaps best left for another forum.

42. See Friedrich Nietzsche, *On the Genealogy of Morals*, ed. and trans. Walter Kaufmann (New York, 1959).

43. *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* 11.7.1.3; cf. 12.8.3.12.

44. See Mircea Eliade's *Yoga: Immortality and Freedom* (Princeton, 1958) for this interpretation of the goal of yoga and other ascetic practices stemming from Upaniṣadic times.

45. Kane, *History of Dharmaśāstra*, vol. 2, p. 780, however, points out that 'Centuries were required before the views propounded by Manu [and thus a certain segment of Brahmins] became predominant. Gradually large sections of the population of India gave up flesh-eating and even those who did not regard it as forbidden to them rarely partook of it or did so in an apologetic way.'

46. Culminating in the pan-Indian reign of Asoka Maurya, who was, at the least, influenced by Buddhism and perhaps a fully-fledged convert.

47. N. C. Sen-Gupta, *Sources of Law and Society in Ancient India* (Calcutta, 1914), p. 15.

48. For a fine discussion of the implications of these lists, see Zimmermann, *The Jungle and the Aroma of Meats*, op. cit., pp. 96, 99, and 133. See also Jack Goody, 'What's in a list?', pp. 74–111 of *The Domestication of the Savage Mind* (Cambridge, 1977).

49. 'It should be recalled that although the Brahman is characterized in the Vedic period by his sacrificial function, in the Hindu period, in harmony with the decline of the sacrifice in favour of other rites, the Brahman is, above all, purity.' Louis Dumont, *Homo Hierarchicus: The Caste System and its Implications*, trans. Mark Saisbury, Louis Dumont, and Basia Gulati (Chicago, 1980), p. 70.

50. Correlatively, in the Upaniṣads one finds the proposition that it is no longer necessary to sacrifice to the gods. That is, one is no longer called upon to offer oneself up (deploying substitutes, of course) as food to the divinities who are higher on the food chain. See, for example, *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad* 1.4.10.

51. In terms of the imitation of the priest's vegetarian diet and non-violent lifestyle, it might be better to speak of the imitation of the ascetic or world-renouncer. There are other reasons for being wary of speaking about 'Brahminization' or 'Sanskritization'. As has often been noted, the imitation of the ruler ('Kṣatriyization') is also an operative factor in caste India, as is imitation of the foreigner ('Westernization').

52. For other citations from other texts, see Kane, *History of Dharmaśāstra*, vol. 2, op. cit., pp. 10–11.

53. *Homo Hierarchicus*, op. cit., pp. 71–2.

54. Wendy Doniger O'Flaherty, *The Origins of Evil in Hindu Mythology* (Berkeley, 1976), pp. 94–9.

55. This conflict is exhaustively and imaginatively explored by Jan Heesterman in *The Inner Conflict of Tradition* (Chicago, 1985).

56. Brian K. Smith, *Reflections on Resemblance, Ritual, and Religion* (New York, 1989), pp. 203–18.

57. The violence inherent in the sacrifice continues to cause trouble for those who actually perform it. See Frits Staal's account of the recent controversy in India over the issue of whether animals should be sacrificed, as is called for, in the performance of the *agnicayana* ritual. 'The Agnicayana Project', in Staal (ed.) *Agni: The Vedic Ritual of the Fire Altar*, vol. 2 (Berkeley, 1983), esp. pp. 464–8. Staal writes that 'the chief objection was against the sacrifice of goats, a custom that was felt to be not merely barbaric, but contrary to the spirit of a nation dedicated to *ahiṃsā*, "non-violence" ' (p. 464).

58. Cf. *Vedānta Sūtra* 3.1.25 and Dalhana on the *Suśruta Saṃhitā* 10.3 (cited in Zimmermann, *The Jungle and the Aroma of Meats*, op. cit., p. 191): 'The medical practitioner no more commits a crime [when he prescribes fresh blood] than he who kills animals in the accomplishment of a sacrifice.' One result of this declaration that black is white was to make possible the eating of certain meats under sacrificial circumstances. Consuming flesh under the many conditions categorized as constituting an 'emergency' (*āpad*) is also allowable.

59. Madeleine Biardeau and Charles Malamoud, *Le Sacrifice dans l’Inde ancienne* (Paris, 1976), p. 42.

60. As Claude Lévi-Strauss pointed out long ago, it is the purpose of a myth – and much of Manu is mythical in the broadest sense – to ‘provide a logical model capable of overcoming a contradiction (an impossible achievement if, as it happens, the contradiction is real)’. *Structural Anthropology* (New York, 1963), p. 229.

61. For a discussion of the synthesis of sacrificial and anti-sacrificial traditions in India, and the parallel developments in Judaism and Christianity, see Wendy Doniger O'Flaherty, *Other Peoples' Myths: The Cave of Echoes* (New York, 1988), Chapter 4.

62. Gilbert Ryle, *Dilemmas* (Cambridge, 1954), p. 5.

63. See Wendy Doniger O'Flaherty, *Dreams, Illusion, and Other Realities* (Chicago, 1984).

64. A. K. Ramanujan, ‘Is there an Indian way of thinking? An informal essay’, *Contributions to Indian Sociology* (n.s.) 23:1 (1989), pp. 45–8.

65. I am indebted to Sheldon Pollock for this phrase and for the basic argument of this paragraph.

66. George Steiner, *After Babel: Aspects of Language and Translation* (London, 1975), pp. 296–7.

67. Walter Benjamin, 'The Task of the Translator', in *Illuminations: Essays and Reflections*, trans. Harry Zoh, edited and with an introduction by Hannah Arendt (New York, 1969), pp. 69–82; p. 78 (italics added).

68. Cited by Wendy Doniger O'Flaherty in *Tales of Sex and Violence: Folklore, Sacrifice, and Danger in the Jaiminīya Brāhmaṇa* (Chicago, 1985), pp. 4–5.

69. See 8.380–81, 9.235, 11.55, etc.

70. See also 3.1, 222 and 275, and 4.161.

71. *Āśvalāyana Śrauta Sūtra* 1.1.22.

72. Jack Goody argues that such lists are a distinguishing feature of written texts, but this does not seem to hold true for India, where lists occur widely in the genres of aphorism and oral Epic.

73. T. S. Eliot, ‘The Hollow Men’ (1925), in *The Complete Poems and Plays, 1909–1950* (New York: Harcourt, Brace & Company, 1962).

74. T. S. Eliot, ‘Murder in the Cathedral, Part 2’ (1935). (Spoken by Thomas Becket.) In *The Complete Poems and Plays, 1909–1950*, op. cit.

75. See Marc Galanter, *Competing Equalities: Law and the Backward Classes in India* (Berkeley, 1984).

76. In a contemporary Indian Classic Comic version of the great Sanskrit Epic, the *Mahābhārata*, Pandu says to Kunti, 'Manu has said that men, failing to have offspring of their own, may beget them through other chosen ones.' (*Amar Chitra Katha, Mahābhārata* ¶3. 'The Advent of the Kuru Princes', p. 13, paraphrasing the Sanskrit text, *Mahābhārata* 1.111.31, which in turn paraphrases – and, indeed, reverses the point of – Manu 9.158–60).

77. The best are those by A. Burnell and E. W. Hopkins, *Mānavadharmaśāstra*; G. Jha, *Manusmṛti*; and J. D. M. Derrett, *Manuśāstravivaraṇa*. Derrett includes English translations of six of the twelve books of the text as the basis for a translation of Bhāruci's commentary on it (the chief purpose of Derrett's publication), but his text is intentionally over-literal (serving, as it does, only as a point of departure for the translation of the commentary), highly technical, and directed to an audience of fellow experts.

78. Both of these measures may appear innocuous, even sensible, but they go so deeply against the grain (*pratiloman*) of the long academic tradition that has claimed Manu as its special property that they constitute a heresy, and hence must be justified here.

79. In this van Buitenen differed, and I differ, from Robert P. Goldman *et al.*, who have translated the other great epic, the *Rāmāyaṇa* (also in *ślokas*), in discrete verses without paragraphs, as Manu has always been translated.

80. At 9.70 and 9.75 and 11.150, for instance, to choose almost at random three of hundreds of possible examples.

81. Sudhir Kakar, *Intimate Relations: Exploring Indian Sexuality* (Chicago, 1990), pp. 18–19.

82. Similarly, at 8.375, Manu says: ‘A ruler should … be shaved with urine,’ and the commentaries suggest that this might be the urine of a man, a donkey, or a dog. Bühler elevates one of these suggestions into the text: ‘A Kshatriya shall … be shaved with the urine (of an ass).’

83. Indeed, even in cases where an author writes his own commentaries (as, for instance, Abhinavagupta did), we may maintain the option of interpreting him differently, through the hermeneutics of suspicion, and accuse the author of misrepresenting himself and even, perhaps, of misunderstanding his own motives.

84. Again I am indebted to Sheldon Pollock for the ideas in this paragraph.

85. Cf. Ellery Schalk, *From Valor to Pedigree* (Princeton, 1986); H. Oberman, *Forerunners of the Reformation* (Edinburgh, 1986); G. Ebeling, trans. R. A. Wilson, *Luther: An Introduction to His Thought* (London, 1970).

86. Walter Benjamin, ‘The Task of the Translator’, in *Illuminations*, op. cit., p. 79.

87. Jayantakrishna Harikrishna Dave, *Manusmṛti*, with the commentaries of Medhātithi, Sarvajñanārāyaṇa, Kullūka, Rāghavānanda, Nandana, Rāmacandra, Maṇirāma, Govindarāja and Bhāruci, 5 vols. (Bombay: Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, Bharatiya Vidya Series, vol. 29 ff.; 1972–).

88. Vishvanath Narayan Mandlik, *Mānava-Dharma Śāstra (Institutes of Manu)*, with the commentaries of Medhātithi, Sarvajñanārāyaṇa, Kullūka, Rāghavānanda, Nandana, and Rāmachandra, and an Appendix by the Honourable Rao Saheb, 2 vols. (Bombay: Ganpat Krishnaraji's Press, 1886). Vol.3 appends the commentary of Govindarāja, edited by Rao Saheb. This rare volume was generously lent to me by Cornell University.

89. I included two verses in Chapter 11 that Dave omits; see the note on 11.6 . and 11.52. I also followed the commentaries in making minor emendations in Dave's readings of the following verses: at 3.151, I read not *yācayanti* but *yājayanti*, following several commentators; at 3.226, 'ritually pure' follows the commentators in reading *prayatas* for *prahatas*; at 4.173, I read *adharma* ('irreligion') for Dave's *dharma* ('religion'); at 6.66, I read *dūṣita* ('flawed') for Dave's *bhūṣita* ('adorned'); at 7.69, the commentaries' reading of *sasya* (grain) is preferable to Dave's *satya* (truth); at 8.76 I read *pṛṣṭa* ('questioned') for Dave's *dṛṣṭa* ('seen'); at 9.189, 'in the absence of all (heirs)' (*sarvābhāve*) is the reading emended from Dave's *sarvabhāve*, following the commentators; at 10.89, wine (*madya*), as in all other editions, is surely the preferred reading over the misprint *na* in the Dave edition; at 11.193 I read *dvijaḥ* and *brāhmaṇā*. At 12.99, several syllables are transposed in the Dave edition; the text at the end of the first line should read, *vedaśāstram sanātanam*; and at the end of the second line, *yajjantor asya sādhanam*.